Canadian
Advisory Council
on the Status of Women

Conseil
consultatif canadien
sur la situation de la femme

BACKGROUND PAPER

# IMMIGRANT WOMEN IN CANADA: A POLICY PERSPECTIVE

BP 1988-1E

by Shirley B. Seward
Director
and Kathryn McDade
Research Assistant

Studies in Social Policy
The Institute for Research on Public Policy

January 1988

The authors are grateful to Heather Conway, who served as a consultant in the initial stages of the study, and contributed to early drafts of select sections of the paper.

The research for this study was completed in September 1987.

Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women

Prepared for the
Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women
P.O. Box 1541, Station B
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5R5

Background papers are prepared to inform Council members, the general public, and parliamentarians on issues being considered by the Council. They are designed to provide an initial analysis on a subject and to generate public discussion. The information contained in this background paper was provided by the authors, and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Council.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | |
|---|---|
| **PREFACE** | i |
| **INTRODUCTION** | 1 |
| **RECENT IMMIGRATION TRENDS** | 3 |
| **ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF IMMIGRANT WOMEN** | 9 |
| Labour Force Participation | 9 |
| Unemployment | 10 |
| Income | 11 |
| Knowledge of Official Languages | 13 |
| Occupation | 14 |
| **POLICY ISSUES RELATED TO IMMIGRANT WOMEN** | 18 |
| Immigration Policy — The Implications of Entrance in Different Classes | 18 |
| Language Training | 20 |
| Employment Training and Skills Upgrading | 27 |
| Credentials | 31 |
| Child Care | 36 |
| **FOREIGN DOMESTIC WORKERS IN CANADA** | 40 |
| **CONCLUSION** | 48 |
| **APPENDICES** | 55 |
| **NOTES** | 62 |
| **BIBLIOGRAPHY** | 70 |

## PREFACE

In the fall of 1986, the Advisory Council published *Immigrant Women in Canada — Current Issues*, which focussed on the major challenges facing immigrant women in Canadian society. Its analysis of issues such as labour market participation, education, and access to language training and child care was welcomed by many sectors of society, including the public, academia, policy-makers, and immigrant women.

Since the paper's release just over a year ago, many of the issues identified in it have been the centre of ongoing public attention and debate. For example, the paper's findings prompted an invitation to appear before the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration. The Council was pleased that some provinces, most notably Ontario, have recently included domestic workers in employment standards legislation governing hours of work.

The problems of immigrant women continue to be an area of pressing concern for the Council. In response to requests for ways to best address the needs of immigrant women, the Council commissioned this paper, *Immigrant Women in Canada: A Policy Perspective*. The authors were asked to provide up-to-date and in-depth information on the socio-economic characteristics of immigrant women in Canada, and on specified policy issues of major concern to the immigrant women community: the implications of entrance in different classes of immigration; language training; employment training; credentials; child care; and the treatment of foreign domestic workers.

The socio-economic data presented in this document reveal that, **as a group**, immigrant women are doing relatively well. They are, for example, somewhat better represented in managerial and professional occupations than Canadian-born women. And, on average, immigrant women have higher incomes and lower unemployment rates than Canadian-born women. However, the paper also demonstrates that a disproportionate number are in the most disadvantaged groups within Canadian society. On the basis of research and analysis, the authors suggest strategies whereby the situation of these disadvantaged

immigrant women might be improved, particularly in terms of their role in the labour force.

The policy directions proposed in this paper include: universal access to fully subsidized, government-sponsored language training courses; reform of the Canadian Jobs Strategy to facilitate increased participation by immigrant women in employment training programs; greater sensitivity to the problems faced by many immigrant women with respect to recognition of their credentials; and development of culturally sensitive child-care options. With regard to the concerns of foreign domestic workers, this paper alerts us to potential changes in current policy which might restrict certain groups of women from entering Canada.

The scope of this study did not permit an explicit focus on important issues such as the special challenges faced by visible minority women, or the role and contribution of professional and business immigrant women in Canada. These and other topics have been suggested by the authors as issues deserving further research.

*Immigrant Women in Canada: A Policy Perspective* has effectively set the stage for further discussion between the Council and others working toward improving the status of immigrant women in Canadian society. The Council believes that the major gaps in policies and programs can only be closed if the voices and experiences of immigrant women are taken into account; as a result, it will be launching an extensive series of consultations across the country to discuss the options set out in this paper, as well as other concerns which are critical to immigrant and visible minority women. On the basis of these consultations, the Council will develop official policies and recommendations aimed at improving the lives of immigrant women in Canada.

**Sylvia Gold**
**President**

## INTRODUCTION

Immigration has played a major role in Canada's economic, demographic, and social development. In addition to being a significant source of population and labour force growth, immigration has stimulated demand which has contributed to an expanding Canadian market for goods and services. At the same time, it has created a rich and varied cultural mosaic in our society.

At the time of the 1981 census, there were 3.8 million immigrants in Canada, representing 16 per cent of the total population and just over 19 per cent of the total labour force. Historically, more men than women have immigrated to Canada. In 1911, there were 158 men for every 100 women in Canada's immigrant population. Over time this gap narrowed and in the 1971 and 1981 censuses, the proportion of immigrant men and women was roughly equal. In other words, approximately 50 per cent of all immigrants in Canada today are women.[1]

In recent years, there has been growing recognition of the significance of immigration. An important body of literature has emerged, and policy debate about immigration issues has increased. Nonetheless, our understanding of the nature and impact of immigration is still poorly developed, compared to other areas of public policy. This is particularly the case with respect to immigrant women, who have tended to be a relatively neglected component of the immigrant population, with respect both to research and to policy formulation.

The purpose of this paper is to redress this neglect, by focussing specifically on the characteristics, special needs, and public policy issues relevant to foreign-born migrant women in Canada. In this analysis, migrant women include immigrants who have entered Canada as permanent residents and domestic workers who have come to Canada on temporary employment authorizations. The paper will build on previous work by a number of researchers and immigrant action groups, as cited in the bibliography.

Recent immigration trends in terms of class of admission, gender breakdown, and country of origin are examined in the first section of the paper. The second section analyses the economic and social characteristics of immigrant women, including rates of labour force participation, unemployment rates, income levels, official languages ability, and occupational status. The discussion of occupational status will focus on a particularly disadvantaged group of immigrant women in the clothing industry. In the third section, the key policy issues related to immigrant women are discussed. These include immigration policy (the implications of entrance in different classes), language training, employment training and skills upgrading, credentials, and child care. Although emphasis will be on policy at the federal level, wherever relevant, matters of provincial concern will also be raised. The fourth section describes recent trends, legislative changes, and working conditions of foreign domestic workers in Canada. Finally, the concluding section proposes policy directions and points to the need for further research.

Four aspects of this study should be noted at the outset. First, the scope of this paper does not permit explicit attention to the issue of systemic discrimination on the basis of race and ethnicity; however, the analysis does include reference to the role and status of particular ethnic groups as appropriate. Second, the study does not include a discussion of the special needs of refugee women. Third, while the paper discusses the socio-economic characteristics and needs of all immigrant women, the emphasis is on women in the labour force, particularly those who are in low-skill, low-wage occupations. Future research should be directed to the contribution of immigrant women who are in professional occupations and in small business. And fourth, the paper is limited to a comparison of the social and economic characteristics of immigrant women and Canadian-born women, although it is recognized that it would be useful to consider the socio-economic position of immigrant women relative to that of the entire Canadian population, including immigrant men and Canadian-born men as sub-groups. Decisions regarding the scope of the paper were based on the need to focus discussion in a manageable way. The issues which were omitted are sufficiently important to merit separate study in their own right.

## RECENT IMMIGRATION TRENDS

The present Canadian immigration program is based on the 1976 *Immigration Act* and the regulations promulgated in April 1978. It provides for three classes of permanent residents: Family Class; Convention Refugees and Designated Classes; and Independent Class. These classes reflect the social, humanitarian, and economic objectives of immigration policy.

In the **Family Class**, Canadian citizens and permanent residents aged 18 and over living in Canada have the right to sponsor the applications of specified close relatives who wish to immigrate to Canada. Relatives eligible for admission in the Family Class include the sponsor's: spouse and spouse's single children (under 21); single children under 21; parents and grandparents who are 60 years of age and older and their dependants; parents and grandparents under 60 who are widowed or who cannot work and their dependants; single orphaned brothers, sisters, nephews, nieces or grandchildren under 18; and fiancé(e) and his/her single children under 21. On August 11, 1987, the Minister of Employment and Immigration announced that on the basis of recommendations made by the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration, regulations will be revised to include unmarried children of any age in the relatives eligible for admission in the Family Class.[2]

Family Class applicants must meet basic standards of good health and character, but are not assessed according to the point system, which is described below for the Independent Class. Instead, the sponsoring relative in Canada signs an undertaking of support. In this statement, the sponsor promises to provide for the lodging, care, and maintenance of the applicant and accompanying dependants for a period of between one and ten years.[3]

The second class of immigrants includes **Convention Refugees and Designated Classes**. Convention Refugees are persons who meet the definition set out in the *Immigration Act*, which is based on the United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. (A Convention refugee is any person who, by reason of a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion,

nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his/her nationality or former habitual residence and is unable or, by reason of such fear, is unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of, or return to, that country.) Designated Classes are persons in refugee-like situations who do not necessarily meet Convention Refugee criteria, but who nonetheless are persecuted and/or displaced and hence are in need of the opportunity to resettle in Canada. The latter include Indochinese; political prisoners and oppressed persons from countries such as El Salvador, Guatemala, Chile, Uruguay, and Poland; and self-exiled persons from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, excluding Yugoslavia.[4]

Refugees and persons in Designated Classes are assessed according to the same factors as the Independent Class described below, but no points are awarded. Instead, the factors are used as guidelines in a subjective assessment of how easily and successfully the applicant may be expected to adapt to Canadian life, and whether sponsorship of at least one year is available from governmental or private organizations.

The **Independent Class** includes principal applicants and their dependants and, with some exceptions (e.g., Retirees), is heavily weighted toward satisfying economic needs, particularly Canada's labour market needs. The class includes: Business Immigrants (Entrepreneurs, Investors, and the Self-Employed), Retirees, Assisted Relatives, and Other Independent immigrants.

Principal applicants are admitted on the basis of accumulating a minimum number of points from a range of factors including education, skills, experience, occupation, arranged employment, age, and knowledge of an official language. Over time the factors and weight attached to each of these factors have varied. Current regulations stipulate that successful applicants must achieve 70 points out of a possible 100 (see Chart 1).

The Assisted Relatives category within the Independent Class includes applicants, other than members of the Family Class, who are unable to qualify for selection in their own right but who have a relative in Canada who is able and willing to help them become established here. Sponsorship undertakings in the Assisted Relatives category are of five years duration.[5] The sponsorship arrangement entitles Assisted Relatives to 10 bonus points, which assists them in achieving a pass mark of 70 points within the regular point system.

Over the past 15 years, there have been considerable shifts in the proportion of immigrants admitted in each of the three classes. As indicated in Table 1, until very recently the Family Class has been growing as a proportion of the total flow of immigrants, from approximately 27 per cent in 1971 to almost 50 per cent in 1984. This proportion fell to under 43 per cent in 1986. While the Convention Refugee and Designated Classes represented just under 8 per cent of the total flow of immigrants in 1976, this proportion had increased to over 19 per cent in 1986. By contrast, the share of Independent Class immigrants fell dramatically from approximately 73 per cent in 1971 to about 33 per cent in 1984, although it increased to over 38 per cent in 1986. In short, while there has been some reversal in the past two years, the proportion of highly educated, skilled, and experienced immigrants selected on the basis of the point system has declined since the early 1970s.

It is particularly revealing to examine the gender composition of the three classes of immigrants. Over the period 1980-1986, 53 per cent of women entered within the Family Class, compared to less than 41 per cent of men (Table 2). The policy implications of entrance in different classes, particularly in terms of their access to training, are explored in the third section of this paper.

**CHART 1 SELECTION CRITERIA FOR ASSISTED RELATIVES AND OTHER INDEPENDENT IMMIGRANTS**

| Factor | Units of Assessment | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| Education | 12 maximum | |
| Specific Vocational preparation | 15 maximum | Minimum of 1 unit required |
| Experience | 8 maximum | |
| Occupation | 10 maximum | 0 units is an automatic processing bar, unless applicant has arranged employment |
| Arranged Employment | 10 | |
| Age | 10 maximum | 10 units if 21 to 44<br>Two units subtracted per year if under 21 or over 44 |
| Knowledge of Official Language(s) | 15 maximum | |
| Personal Suitability | 10 maximum | |
| Levels Control | 10 maximum | Set at 5 units effective January 1, 1986 |
| Total | 100 | |
| Pass Mark | 70 | |
| Bonus for Assisted Relatives | 10 | If application is accompanied by an undertaking of assistance |

Source: Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Your Rights and Canada's Immigration Law* (Ottawa: 1986), p. 16.

**TABLE 1 IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA, BY CLASS OF ADMISSION, 1971-1986**

| Year | Family Class | % of Total | Convention Refugee and Designated Classes | % of Total | Independent and Assisted Relatives | % of Total | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1971 | 33,450 | 27.4 | -- | -- | 88,450 | 72.6 | 121,900 |
| 1976 | 60,830 | 40.7 | 11,751 | 7.9 | 76,848 | 51.4 | 149,429 |
| 1981 | 51,017 | 39.7 | 14,979 | 11.6 | 62,622 | 48.7 | 128,618 |
| 1984 | 43,814 | 49.7 | 15,342 | 17.4 | 29,083 | 32.9 | 88,239 |
| 1986 | 42,181 | 42.5 | 19,140 | 19.3 | 37,854 | 38.2 | 99,175 |

Sources: Data for 1971-1984 based on Kevin B. Kerr, *Immigration and the Canadian Labour Market*, background paper prepared for the Economics Division, Research Branch, Library of Parliament (Ottawa: Library of Parliament, September 1986), Table 1, page 5; 1986 calculations based on unpublished data provided by Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, Planning and Program Management Branch, Program Data.

**TABLE 2 IMMIGRANTS AGE 15 AND OVER, BY CLASS OF ADMISSION AND SEX, CANADA 1980-1986**

| | | | | | INDEPENDENT CLASS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Family Class | Convention Refugees | Designated Classes | Assisted Relatives | Business | Retirees | Other Independent |
| | (per cent distribution) | | | | | | | |
| Females | 100.0 | 53.0 | 2.2 | 10.5 | 8.2 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 19.3 |
| Males | 100.0 | 40.6 | 4.3 | 16.4 | 8.8 | 5.6 | 2.1 | 22.2 |

Source: Calculations based on unpublished data provided by Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, Planning and Program Management Branch, Program Data.

Note: Totals may not add up to 100.0 per cent due to rounding.

In addition to the above changes in class of entry of immigrants entering Canada in recent years, there have also been major shifts in their countries of origin. As shown in Table 3, the traditional European countries of birth of immigrants have declined as a proportion of total immigrants, from approximately 35 per cent in 1978 to about 23 per cent in 1986. At the same time, immigrants from developing countries — especially Asia — have become a more significant factor. In 1986, almost 42 per cent of immigrants were from Asia, an increase from approximately 28 per cent in 1978.

**TABLE 3 IMMIGRANTS, BY WORLD AREA OF LAST PERMANENT RESIDENCE AND YEAR OF LANDING, CANADA 1978-1986**

| World Area of Last Permanent Residence | 1978 | 1981 | 1984 | 1986 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | (per cent distribution) | | |
| Europe | 34.8 | 36.0 | 23.7 | 22.9 |
| Africa | 4.9 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.8 |
| Asia | 27.8 | 38.0 | 47.5 | 41.9 |
| Australia | 1.4 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| North and Central America | 12.6 | 9.0 | 12.5 | 13.5 |
| Caribbean | 9.6 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 8.9 |
| South America | 7.9 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 6.7 |
| Oceania and Other Ocean Islands | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Sources: Data for 1978-1984 based on Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Immigration Statistics* (Ottawa: 1984), Table 1M7, pp. 28-30; 1986 calculations based on unpublished data provided by Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, Planning and Program Management Branch, Program Data.

Note: Totals may not add up to 100.0 per cent due to rounding.

## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF IMMIGRANT WOMEN[6]

In almost every respect, immigrant women, **as a group**, appear to be doing better economically than Canadian-born women. Underlying these averages, however, is great heterogeneity among immigrant women based on country of origin and length of time in Canada. Most significantly, a disproportionate number of immigrant women are in the most disadvantaged groups within Canadian society.

### Labour Force Participation

A cursory examination of 1981 census data indicates that the labour force participation rate of Canadian-born women (52.1 per cent) is higher than that of immigrant women (50.6 per cent). This is very misleading, however, given the older age structure of the female immigrant population, and given the relationship between age and labour force participation. When adjustments are made for this age differential, the participation rate of immigrant women rises to 55.6 per cent, which is higher than the 52.1 per cent which characterizes Canadian-born women (Table 4).

The rate of labour force participation of immigrant women varies with length of time in Canada. After adjusting for age, the longer the time in Canada, the higher the participation rate of immigrant women. Interestingly, the only female immigrants with adjusted participation rates lower than Canadian-born women at the time of the 1981 Census were those who had arrived in Canada most recently (between 1976 and 1981).[7] To a certain extent, this may reflect the time required for immigrants to learn one of Canada's official languages, or to find employment. It could also reflect the declining proportion of immigrants in the Independent Class, who are selected on the assumption that they are destined to the labour force.

**TABLE 4 LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES FOR THE IMMIGRANT AND CANADIAN-BORN POPULATIONS, BY SEX, CANADA 1981**

| | IMMIGRANTS[a] | | CANADIAN-BORN |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Actual | Adjusted[b] | |
| Male | 77.9 | 79.4 | 78.3 |
| Female | 50.6 | 55.6 | 52.1 |

Source: Nancy McLaughlin, "The Labour Force Participation of Canada's Immigrants", *The Labour Force* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, September 1985), catalogue no. 71-001, Table 6, p. 98.

Notes: (a) An immigrant is defined in census terms as a permanent resident of Canada who is not a Canadian citizen by birth. Persons born abroad to Canadian parents are not included. A few persons born in Canada who were not considered as Canadians at birth but later obtained Canadian resident status are included in the immigrant population.

(b) To yield the participation rate that immigrants would have if they had the same age distribution as the Canadian-born population (adjusted rate) the immigrant participation rate for each age group was multiplied by the percentage of the Canadian-born population in that age group; the results were then added up and the total divided by 100.

Participation rates also vary by country of origin. Caribbean-born women exhibit the highest age-adjusted labour force participation rates (63.5 per cent), followed by immigrants from Southeast Asia (60.1 per cent), Oceania and Other Regions (59.0 per cent), and the United Kingdom (57.9 per cent). All these rates are considerably higher than that of Canadian-born women.[8]

**Unemployment**

In 1981, immigrant women had lower unemployment rates than Canadian-born men or women (Table 5). However, the more recent the arrival, the higher the unemployment rate. As with participation rates, this trend is undoubtedly related to adjustment problems associated with length of time in Canada. In addition, those immigrants who arrived in Canada in the mid to late 1970s would have encountered relatively high general unemployment levels

in the country, and might have been in a disadvantaged position compared to longer-term immigrants. In spite of these problems, even the most recent category of female immigrant arrivals (1971-1981) had lower unemployment rates than Canadian-born women.

**TABLE 5 UNEMPLOYMENT RATES OF THE POPULATION 15 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER, BY SEX, CANADIAN-BORN/FOREIGN-BORN, AND PERIOD OF IMMIGRATION, CANADA 1981**

| | Female | Male |
|---|---|---|
| Canadian-born[a] | 9.2 | 7.1 |
| Foreign-Born[a] | 6.5 | 3.8 |
| Period of Immigration | | |
| Before 1946 | 4.9 | 3.0 |
| 1946-1960 | 5.0 | 2.8 |
| 1961-1970 | 6.4 | 4.0 |
| 1971-1981[b] | 8.4 | 5.2 |

Source: Extracted from Canada, Statistics Canada, *Population. Labour Force Activity* (Ottawa: 1984), 1981 Census of Canada, catalogue no. 92-915, Table 2, p. 1; also presented in Monica Boyd, *Migrant Women in Canada: Profiles and Policies*, paper prepared for the OECD Sub-panel on Migrant Women, Paris, April 6-7, 1987, Ottawa: March 1987, Table 15, p. 60.

Notes: (a) See Footnote (a), Table 4.
(b) Includes the first five months only of 1981.

**Income**

Immigrant women tend to do better than Canadian-born women in terms of median income. As shown in Table 6, the median income of immigrant women aged 15 and over in 1980 ($6,727) was almost 9 per cent higher than the median income of Canadian-born women aged 15 and over ($6,200). Also, a smaller proportion of immigrant women (21 per cent) than Canadian-born women (23 per cent) had no income.

Once again, it would appear that there is considerable heterogeneity among immigrant women, and that the most recent arrivals are the most disadvantaged. Table 6 illustrates that over 40 per cent of those who arrived between 1976 and 1981 had no income, and the median income for the remainder of these recent arrivals was considerably lower than that of the foreign-born as a whole or that of Canadian-born women.

**TABLE 6 1980 INCOME (IN 1980 DOLLARS) FOR THE FEMALE POPULATION AGE 15 AND OVER, BY CANADIAN-BORN/FOREIGN-BORN AND YEAR OF IMMIGRATION[a], CANADA**

| | | Foreign-Born and Year of Immigration | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Canadian-Born[a] | Total[b] | 1956-1960 | 1961-1965 | 1966-1970 | 1971-1975 | 1976-1981[c] |
| **Per Cent with No Income** | | | | | | | |
| Total, 15 years and over | 23 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 42 |
| **Median Income[d]** | | | | | | | |
| Total, 15 years and over | 6,200 | 6,727 | 8,444 | 7,797 | 8,161 | 8,141 | 5,606 |
| **Ratio, Foreign-Born/ Canadian-Born Median Income[d]** | | | | | | | |
| Total, 15 years and over | -- | 1.09 | 1.36 | 1.26 | 1.32 | 1.31 | 0.90 |

Source: Extracted from Monica Boyd, "Migrant Women in Canada: Profiles and Policies", paper prepared for the Research Division, Immigration Canada and Status of Women Canada (March 1987), Table 18, p. 63; paper also presented to the OECD Sub-panel on Migrant Women.

Notes: (a) See Footnote (a), Table 4.
(b) Includes females immigrating before 1956.
(c) Includes first five months only of 1981.
(d) For females with income.

**Knowledge of Official Languages**

Various analyses of census data and immigration statistics have indicated that large numbers of immigrants have limited knowledge of either of Canada's official languages, and that the magnitude of the problem varies by gender and country of origin.

On the basis of 1981 census data, the Multiculturalism Directorate of the Secretary of State reported that 218,080 Canadians age 15 and over spoke neither official language (representing 1.2 per cent of the total Canadian population age 15 and over). Of this number, 92.8 per cent were immigrants or naturalized Canadians. Among Canadians of all ages who spoke neither English nor French, 61.3 per cent were women.[9]

Another analysis of 1981 census data revealed that immigrants from Southern Europe and Asia were most seriously disadvantaged in terms of knowledge of official languages, and that for most birthplace groups, "the percentage of females not knowing one or both of the official languages is nearly double that reported by males".[10]

As shown in Table 7, more recent 1986 immigration statistics reveal that nearly 40 per cent of all women immigrants 15 years of age and older claimed they had no knowledge of either French or English prior to arrival in Canada. Of those assessed under the point system (Independent Class), 19.0 per cent claimed to have no official languages ability at the time of admission. This figure was much higher for Family Class (43.9 per cent) and Refugees and Designated Classes (80.8 per cent).

As will be seen below, language ability is closely related to the types of employment that immigrant women can obtain and the economic status they can hope to achieve. In the third section of this paper dealing with policy issues, the implications for language training and skills training are examined.

**TABLE 7 OFFICIAL LANGUAGE ABILITY OF FEMALE IMMIGRANTS 15 YEARS AND OLDER, BY IMMIGRATION CLASS, 1986**

| Immigration Class | English | % of Total | French | % of Total | English and French | % of Total | None | % of Total | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Classes | 21,100 | 50.9 | 1,936 | 4.7 | 1,843 | 4.4 | 16,542 | 39.9 | 41,421 |
| Family Class | 10,441 | 48.9 | 935 | 4.4 | 625 | 2.9 | 9,385 | 43.9 | 21,386 |
| Refugees and Designated Classes | 835 | 15.4 | 126 | 2.3 | 75 | 1.4 | 4,371 | 80.8 | 5,407 |
| Independent Class | 9,824 | 67.2 | 875 | 6.0 | 1,143 | 7.8 | 2,786 | 19.0 | 14,628 |

Source: Calculations based on unpublished data provided by Employment and Immigration Canada, Planning and Program Management Branch, Program Data.

**Occupation**

Immigrant women are located at the highest and at the lowest points of the occupational scale. As shown in Table 8, a slightly greater proportion of immigrant women than Canadian-born women had well-paid managerial and administrative jobs in 1981. However, compared to Canadian-born women, immigrant women were more heavily concentrated in service occupations, as well as in the processing, fabricating, assembly, and construction category of occupations. Many of these occupations are characterized by low-skill and low-wage jobs.

**TABLE 8 OCCUPATION FOR FEMALES AGE 15 YEARS AND OLDER, BY PLACE OF BIRTH, CANADA 1981**

| Occupational Group (Standard Occupational Classification)[a] | Canada | Foreign-Born[b] | Foreign-Born by Place of Birth | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | U.S.A. | U.K. | Southern Europe | Other Europe | Asia | Other |
| Total Number | 3,888,100 | 908,825 | 65,195 | 200,675 | 179,245 | 200,810 | 137,740 | 125,170 |
| Total Per Cent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Managerial and Administrative | 5.4 | 5.5 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 2.7 | 6.9 | 4.6 | 4.3 |
| Social and Physical Sciences, Teaching[c] | 10.1 | 8.2 | 18.7 | 9.7 | 3.2 | 9.5 | 6.6 | 7.0 |
| Medicine, Health, Artistic, Literary[d] | 10.2 | 9.7 | 11.5 | 10.4 | 2.9 | 9.9 | 12.3 | 13.9 |
| Clerical | 37.8 | 30.2 | 30.4 | 40.4 | 18.7 | 28.5 | 28.3 | 34.9 |
| Sales | 9.6 | 8.3 | 9.3 | 11.0 | 6.0 | 10.8 | 5.8 | 5.7 |
| Service | 15.3 | 17.6 | 12.9 | 13.1 | 24.2 | 18.3 | 18.7 | 15.6 |
| Farming, Forestry, Mining[e] | 2.5 | 2.1 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 4.1 | 1.7 | 0.7 |
| Processing, Fabricating, Assembly, Construction[f] | 6.3 | 14.7 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 34.6 | 8.9 | 18.3 | 13.8 |
| Transport Equipment, Other[g] | 2.8 | 3.7 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 6.1 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 4.1 |

Source: Monica Boyd, "Migrant Women in Canada: Profiles and Policies", paper prepared for the Research Division, Immigration Canada and Status of Women (March 1987), Table 17, p. 62; paper also presented to the OECD Sub-panel on Migrant Women.

Notes:
(a) Excludes persons not reporting an occupation.
(b) Includes persons born outside Canada who are Canadian citizens by birth.
(c) Includes Standard Occupational Classification (S.O.C.) numbers 21, 23, 25, 27.
(d) Includes S.O.C. numbers 31, 33.
(e) Includes S.O.C. numbers 71, 73, 75, 77.
(f) Includes S.O.C. numbers 81/82, 83, 85, 87.
(g) Includes S.O.C. numbers 91, 93, 95, 99.

In order to illustrate the disadvantaged position of large numbers of immigrant women, it is useful to focus on specific occupations where many immigrant women are employed. Immigrant women are significantly over-represented in the fabricating, assembling, and repair occupations in the textile, fur, and leather industries. (In this breakdown, "textiles" includes clothing and knitting.) In 1981, 148,800 women were employed in these occupations. Relatively few men are employed — 76 per cent of all workers were female, while only 24 per cent were males. Of the women employed in these occupations, almost 48 per cent were born outside Canada. In other words, approximately 36 per cent of all workers employed in these occupations in 1981 were immigrant women.[11]

Within this occupational cluster, the single most commonly held job by immigrant women is that of sewing machine operator. In 1981, 47,435 immigrant women (or 67 per cent of all immigrant women in the above occupations) were sewing machine operators. Of these women, 51 per cent were born in Southern Europe and an additional 26 per cent were born in Asia.[12]

The concentration of Southern European and Asian immigrant women in the clothing industry is not surprising. As noted above, women from these two areas are most disadvantaged in terms of English or French language ability. This, together with limited work-related skills and education, forces Southern European and Asian immigrant women to take employment in the low-skill clothing industry where language skills are not necessary. The result is that they will have little opportunity to learn an official language or other job skills. Once in these job ghettos, immigrant women's occupational mobility is very limited.

The clothing industry is one of the most vulnerable industries in the Canadian economy. For many years, it has faced competition from developing countries, where labour costs are lower. Since a major competitive disadvantage relates to this factor, garment manufacturers are under constant pressure to keep such costs as low as possible.[13]

In order to remain competitive, a number of larger manufacturers have moved production to developing countries. Many smaller manufacturers have responded by: keeping wages as low as possible through mechanisms such as piece work; minimizing overhead costs; and restructuring the place and organization of garment production, retaining tasks such as pattern making and cutting as factory work, while organizing sewing through homework. The results of these strategies are unemployment, job insecurity, poor wages, and poor working conditions. Between 1981 and 1985, 23,300 jobs were lost in the textile and clothing industry; and in 1985 the average weekly earnings in clothing were only 55 per cent of earnings in all manufacturing industries.[14]

The restructuring of garment production through the use of homework allows the manufacturer to reduce costs by employing more or less labour as needed, and by avoiding many overhead expenses as well as employee benefits. The homeworker assumes some of the costs of production. According to one researcher, "conventionally, the homeworker pays for her own machine and machine maintenance, electricity, thread, delivery costs and telephone bills".[15] From the perspective of homeworkers themselves, one of the main reasons for working in the home rather than in a factory is that it enables women to care for their children at the same time. This puts a very great burden on the women, as they must combine sewing, child care, and other domestic responsibilities. The result is frequently very long hours and exhaustion.[16]

It is extremely difficult to estimate the number of homeworkers in Canada. From the number of homeworkers registered by employers (and thereby covered by employment standards legislation and possibly collective agreements) it is possible to estimate the much larger number of illegal homeworkers who have not been reported by their employers to government authorities. Taken together, this results in estimates of the total number of homeworkers as 7,620 in Ontario and 10,000 in Quebec in 1980.[17] Given the high proportion of immigrant women in the textile industry who are sewing machine operators, it is reasonable to assume that a large proportion of homeworkers are immigrant women.

Homeworkers in Canada are subject to regulation by provincial employment standards legislation. "But the combination of a high proportion of employers who ignore requirements for registration of homeworkers and the failure of governments to impose fines or other penalties on employers who are found to violate existing standards means that the practice of homework is, for the most part, unregulated."[18] Moreover, suspected violations are investigated only when a formal complaint has been received. This does not happen often, however, because homeworkers generally are not aware of their legal rights and many are not sufficiently fluent in English or French to lodge a complaint.[19]

Thus, while conditions for clothing factory workers are poor, they appear to be even worse for homeworkers. As Laura Johnson has observed, there are two classes of workers in the clothing industry:

> . . . the inside factory workers, who receive regular wages, benefits and overtime pay for overtime hours — and the homeworkers, who receive none of these things. Within an industry already known for low wages, high pressures of work and poor working conditions, the homeworkers are extremely disadvantaged.[20]

## POLICY ISSUES RELATED TO IMMIGRANT WOMEN[21]

### Immigration Policy — The Implications of Entrance in Different Classes

As seen in the first section, a higher proportion of women than men enter Canada in the Family Class, and over the period 1980-1986, an additional 8.2 per cent of all immigrant women entered as Assisted Relatives within the Independent Class (Table 2). In both cases, the woman is sponsored, generally by a man, who undertakes to financially support her for a designated period of time.

From a positive perspective, this sponsorship arrangement facilitates the immigration of many persons — particularly women with lower education or skills — who might not qua'ify if assessed under the point system. However, immigrant advocacy groups and scholars have documented a number of disadvantages associated with sponsorship. Two key issues — access to basic language training allowances and eligibility for social services — illustrate these concerns.

Sponsored immigrants are not entitled to the basic training allowance associated with Employment and Immigration Canada's language training programs, although they are entitled to a dependant care allowance, commuting allowance, living away from home allowance, and long distance transportation allowance. Upon arrival in Canada many immigrant women must work for pay in order to ensure adequate income for their families. Ineligibility for a basic language training allowance therefore prevents many women from taking such training, since they would have to forego employment income during the training period. The issue of language training will be elaborated further below in a separate discussion on this topic.

A second disadvantage of sponsorship is that it limits immigrant women's access to income assistance and social welfare programs such as legal aid and publicly subsidized housing. In cases of family violence or marriage breakdown, sponsored immigrants must prove, prior to receiving assistance, that the sponsorship relationship has broken down. While meeting this requirement does not require legal intervention, it can delay access. Even in cases where sponsored immigrants are working, they are frequently in low-wage jobs which make self-sufficiency difficult, and which necessitate some government assistance in cases of breach of sponsorship.

Immigrant groups in Canada argue that some immigrant women are not informed of the implications of class of entry, while others may be informed but choose to enter in the Family Class or as Assisted Relatives to expedite the process. An important complication, of course, is that many prospective immigrants are not aware that two incomes may be necessary to support a family in Canada. Therefore, even if immigrant women are informed of the implications of entrance in different classes, they may not feel the

implications are relevant to them. The solution is either to change the eligibility criteria for government programs, or to better inform prospective immigrants not only regarding the implications of class of entry, but also regarding economic conditions in Canada, and the possibility that both spouses may have to work in order to support their families.

There appears to be some recognition of these problems at the federal level. In 1986, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration recommended that Family Class sponsorships should last for a maximum of three years.[22] In its response to these recommendations, the federal government has indicated that it "intends to maintain . . . its current policy, which is that sponsorship undertakings are valid from one to ten years".[23] The government has agreed, however, to issue a reminder to immigration officers to carry out a case-by-case assessment in determining the duration of sponsorship, rather than simply imposing a 10-year sponsorship period as a matter of routine.[24]

**Language Training**

The issue of access to quality official language training is fundamental to immigrant women who speak neither French nor English. ". . . Access or non-access to language training structures their lives by organizing their pattern of employment, their isolation from society and their dependency on family and others".[25]

The funding of official language training is divided between two federal departments — Secretary of State and Employment and Immigration Canada (CEIC) — each with a different underlying philosophy as to its purpose and objective. The programs are designed and delivered by the provinces through a vast array of mechanisms and programs.

The Department of the Secretary of State, under the Citizenship Instruction and Language Training Agreements (CILT), reimburses 50 per cent of provincial expenses for language training for citizenship purposes and for

citizenship instruction. The Department will also pay up to 100 per cent of the cost of textbooks and other printed teaching materials. There is no upper limit to funding by Secretary of State. The Department's view of language training is that it is fundamental to ensuring successful integration into Canadian society. All immigrants who are not yet Canadian citizens are eligible for training, regardless of class of entry, gender, or employment status.

Under the CILT agreements, educational institutions offer classroom instruction during the day or in the evening, primarily on a part-time basis. In some cases, innovative schools participate with community groups to provide less formal programs, such as classes for mothers and preschoolers. In these instances, child care may be provided while women take classes.[26]

Because the provinces are not required to submit detailed information on classes and clientele, Secretary of State does not know how many clients are served by the program each year. There is general agreement that the CILT agreements have been interpreted increasingly loosely to allow for flexibility in targetting the real needs of clients. In Ontario, for example, many of the part-time programs jointly funded by the province and the federal government are actually literacy classes or they may provide advanced language training to immigrants who have exhausted their eligibility for the CEIC-sponsored programs.[27] While the Secretary of State language training agreements allow for flexibility in program delivery, their use and effectiveness are directly related to the level of commitment to language training provincially, and this in turn is strongly related to the level of initiative at the municipal and community levels. Because commitment varies considerably in different parts of the country, this is a serious problem. In New Brunswick, for example, a claim has not been made under the CILT agreements in more than 10 years.[28] (See Table 9 for summary of federal contributions under CILT agreements, 1982-87).

**TABLE 9 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE CITIZENSHIP INSTRUCTION AND LANGUAGE TRAINING AGREEMENTS, 1982-83 AND 1986-87**

| | 1982-83 | 1986-87 | Average (1982-83 to 1986-87) | Average as a percentage of Canada total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 18,585 | -- | 10,986 | .1 |
| Prince Edward Island | 1,218 | 3,709 | 2,456 | .03 |
| Nova Scotia | 15,580 | -- | 13,849 | .2 |
| New Brunswick | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Quebec | 1,202,925 | 1,129,895 | 1,208,994 | 14.4 |
| Ontario | 3,262,929 | 2,525,848 | 2,833,379 | 33.7 |
| Manitoba | 536,883 | 403,825 | 428,521 | 5.1 |
| Saskatchewan | 100,136 | 90,731 | 76,067 | .9 |
| Alberta | 931,459 | 1,670,120 | 1,314,979 | 15.7 |
| British Columbia | 1,680,102 | 2,407,074 | 2,511,108 | 29.9 |
| Canada | 7,749,817 | 8,231,202 | 8,400,326 | 100.0 |

Source: Extracted from unpublished data prepared by Sally Andrews, Policy Analyst, Corporate Policy Branch, Secretary of State (August 1987).

Note: Total may not add up to 100.0 per cent due to rounding.
Although an agreement exists between the federal government and the Yukon, only very small contributions have been made, and none in recent years. There is no agreement with the Northwest Territories.

There are many positive features of the language training provided by Secretary of State, including flexibility, and in some cases, integration of child care, as well as more informal, community-based programs with a multicultural preschool component. The need for this type of flexibility has been stressed by a number of immigrant women's groups whose views appear to have had an impact. Nonetheless, there are serious problems of access. First, the programs do not provide living and travel allowances to participants, and these costs can exclude many low-income women. Second, as seen above, there is unequal provision of language training in different provinces, thereby placing particular groups at a disadvantage. And third, once citizenship has been obtained, immigrants are technically no longer eligible for Secretary of

State language training. (In practice, federal-provincial CILT agreements do not include monitoring procedures. Provincial policy has been to admit citizens to language training.)

Language programs provided by Employment and Immigration Canada (CEIC), unlike those of Secretary of State, are restricted to immigrants who are destined to the labour force. The underlying philosophy as to the purpose of language training is that language is a skill which contributes to an individual's value in the labour market. More successful integration and settlement may result from acquiring a second language, but that is not the goal of CEIC's program. The goal is to assist immigrants to become gainfully employed, and thereby to improve the functioning of the labour market so that needed skills and workers are not under-utilized because individuals lack fluency.

CEIC purchases spaces from the provinces in educational institutions on behalf of clients who meet their eligibility requirements. As already noted, subsidized trainees receive a basic training allowance and may also receive a dependant care allowance, a commuting allowance, a living away from home allowance, and travel assistance. (See Table 10 for number of male and female immigrants who received CEIC-sponsored language training between 1981-82 and 1986-87.)

The objectives of language training, as summarized in the CEIC Employment Manual, indicate that:

> . . . language courses (are) specifically designed to remove the employment barrier which stifles the job-search efforts of two categories of clients, namely:
>
> (i) skilled workers who cannot secure employment in their trade or profession or in a suitable related occupation because of a lack of fluency in a second language; and
>
> (ii) unskilled workers who cannot be placed in suitable employment because of a lack of fluency in a second language.[29]

**TABLE 10 NUMBER OF IMMIGRANT PARTICIPANTS IN CEIC-SPONSORED LANGUAGE TRAINING, CANADA 1981-82 TO 1986-87**

| | Females | Males | Total | Females as a percentage of total participants |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1981-82 | 3,912 | 4,549 | 8,461 | 46.2 |
| 1982-83 | 5,220 | 6,573 | 11,793 | 44.3 |
| 1983-84 | 4,850 | 5,940 | 10,790 | 44.9 |
| 1984-85 | 5,423 | 6,750 | 12,173 | 44.5 |
| 1985-86 | 5,782 | 6,850 | 12,632 | 45.8 |
| 1986-87 | 5,928 | 6,561 | 12,489 | 47.5 |

Source: Based on unpublished data provided by Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, Canadian Jobs Strategy, Planning and Monitoring Branch (June 1987).

The eligibility criteria limit immigrant women's access to CEIC language training in two ways. First, as discussed earlier, sponsored immigrants in the Family Class and Assisted Relatives category are not eligible for the basic training allowance, and this may prevent women who must work to earn income from participating in the full-time CEIC language training. Second, potential participants must demonstrate that their lack of fluency acts as a barrier to suitable employment. However, in the case of unskilled workers with limited qualifications, suitable employment is generally seen to be low-wage, low-skill jobs in the service sector, and in industries such as textiles and clothing. Because knowledge of an official language is not necessary in these occupations, the workers (who are predominantly women) thus do not have access to CEIC language training.

The ineligibility of unskilled female immigrants for CEIC language training exacerbates the ghettoization of particular groups of immigrant women in dead-end occupations. This was illustrated above in the description of Southern European and Asian women in the clothing industry. Moreover, as will be seen below, their lack of language ability makes it difficult for them

to participate in skills upgrading or employment programs, which could facilitate their exit from these ghettos.

The first national conference of immigrant women, held in 1981, also produced detailed recommendations on the subject of language training. A refined version of these recommendations was presented to the federal government in June 1985 by the Action Committee on Immigrant and Visible Minority Women (ACIVMW). The ACIVMW disbanded in November 1986 with the formation of the National Organization of Immigrant and Visible Minority Women of Canada (NOIVMWC). The NOIVMWC will continue to monitor federal progress on language training on the basis of the following major recommendation made by the ACIVMW in 1985:

> We are asking that adequate language (E.S.L. — F.S.L.) training facilities, together with training allowances for a period of at least six (6) months, be provided for all those who need it regardless of status or length of residence in Canada. Provision should be made for day care and travel allowances.[30]

The Canadian Human Rights Commission, in its 1986 Annual Report, supports the requests of immigrant women for revision of language training policy. The Commission notes "the present policy . . . seems to have an adverse effect on a group of persons — immigrant women — on the basis of a prohibited ground of discrimination".[31]

Even women who have been able to qualify for completely subsidized CEIC language training have identified a number of problems, including that existing programs fail to meet the needs of many immigrant women. The organization of classes on a full-time basis is a problem for all women given the labour they perform at home. The difficulty of finding time for full-time study, domestic activities, and child care is exacerbated for women who must also work part-time to supplement their basic training allowance.[32] Immigrant women also report that the content of the curriculum and organization of the classroom in CEIC courses "exclude the specific experiences of immigrant women and in so doing, they fail to address the needs arising from them".[33] The recommendations of the ACIVMW have included: provision of language

training in the workplace, special projects at the community level for groups such as the illiterate and those with cultural barriers to easy integration into Canadian society, and development of radio and television language training programs.

There appears to be some acknowledgement on the part of the federal government of the concerns raised above. An interesting national pilot program was initiated in March 1986 by the Minister of Employment and Immigration; $1 million was allocated for a Settlement Language Training Program (SLTP). The program's stated objective was "to meet the needs of adult immigrants who are not expected to join the labour force. The priority target group is immigrant women at home with family responsibilities."[34] The program's aim was to provide up to 300 hours of instruction to each participant over 10 to 20 weeks, on a part-time basis, with provisions for on-site child care and travel allowances. Instruction was provided through community agencies already serving immigrants. The program ran from September 1986 through March 1987.

TESL Canada[35] has recently completed an assessment of the SLTP program which was commissioned by Employment and Immigration. The assessment is based on the study of two sample SLTP projects in each of the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, and British Columbia. TESL Canada's general assessment of the program is positive:

> The SLTP was a program that could hardly have failed. It had a relatively small amount of money directed toward a major, well-known need . . . Everyone we interviewed — decision-makers, agency personnel, teachers and learners — were uniformly enthusiastic about the intent and the outcomes of the SLTP projects. They want more, longer, and now.[36]

TESL Canada stresses that the success of the program can be attributed to the use of community agencies as deliverers of English as a Second Language (ESL) training, and to the provision of child care and transportation support. They refer to these features of the program as " . . . an ideal combination to meet the needs of the target population".[37]

While the SLTP program appears to be excellent, it clearly reaches only a small population, and does not therefore adequately respond to the 1985 ACIVMW recommendation regarding the provision of fully subsidized, longer term language training to all immigrants, regardless of status or length of time in Canada. Nor has adequate attention been given to the more specific problems of content and organization of the language training programs which currently exist.

The reality is that language training for immigrant women is inconsistent, often inaccessible, and does not always adequately meet their needs. A concerted effort at the federal and provincial levels must be made to develop better programs which would reach a larger number of immigrant women. This is particularly urgent, given the sobering statistics presented in the second section of this paper on the large numbers of women immigrants who cannot speak either of the official languages.

At the time of writing, the Secretary of State and CEIC were undertaking a review of their language training programs with a view toward improving services and reducing overlap.[38] It is hoped this review will address the major problems discussed above.

**Employment Training and Skills Upgrading**

Federal training and skills upgrading programs are set up under the auspices of Employment and Immigration Canada and implemented via a series of programs known collectively as the **Canadian Jobs Strategy (CJS)**. The CJS was introduced in July 1985 and is divided into six programs: **Job Entry**, **Skill Investment**, **Job Development**, **Skill Shortages**, **Community Futures**, and **Innovations**. A range of instruments, including formal training, on-the-job training, practical work experience, and special projects are funded either directly, through purchase of spaces in educational institutions, or via subsidies to employers and other third parties.

Since its inception, the Canadian Jobs Strategy has been criticized for failing to meet the needs of certain groups of workers, including immigrant women. In November 1986, a CJS Delivery Task Force was appointed to review the design and operational features of the Strategy with a view to improving program delivery. On the basis of the recommendations of this Task Force, program changes were announced on June 12, 1987, which address the concerns of immigrant women participants in CJS.[39] These changes, which were to take effect October 1, 1987, are detailed below in the context of a discussion of the current operation of the CJS.

Access to CJS programs has been limited by restrictive eligibility criteria. The **Job Development** program has the greatest potential relevance to immigrant women because it includes an option designed to assist severely employment-disadvantaged persons. However, access has been significantly limited in that participants must have been unemployed for at least 24 out of the last 30 weeks. Many immigrant women cannot afford to be unemployed for a full six months after arriving in Canada, and take low-skill, low-wage jobs which enable them to earn an income. In so doing, they forego the opportunity provided by **Job Development** to receive work experience and training which could lead to better employment opportunities.

The policy change announced recently by the Minister of Employment and Immigration will remove this barrier to participation by immigrant women. Employment projects for severely employment-disadvantaged persons[40] will now be offered as one option within the **Job Entry** program, which means that 24 weeks unemployment will no longer be a criterion for eligibility. Participants in the Severely Employment-Disadvantaged option will be entitled to up to three years training and/or work experience. Other options under the **Job Entry** program include language training (as discussed in the preceding section) and Job Re-Entry. The latter option is specifically designed to assist women making the transition from homemaking to the labour market. It requires women to have been out of the labour force for at least three years in order to qualify for training. The Job Re-Entry option will continue to be accessible to immigrant women who have worked at home for at least three years; for some participants it will be necessary to first undertake language training.

The **Innovations** program is also potentially useful for immigrant women. The program's role is to provide funds for "pilot projects, demonstration projects and developmental activities which will lead to improved functioning of the labour market".[41] Furthermore, funding under the **Innovations** program is based on proposals initiated by Canadian individuals and groups. Thus, there would appear to be potential within the program to get funding for innovative projects in such areas as language training, particularly since, as we have seen, ability in one of the official languages affects the role and opportunities of immigrants in the labour market. However, a review of the projects sponsored under the **Innovations** program reveals that, of approved and contracted expenditures of $76.7 million for current projects (as of April 1987), only two projects are remotely related to the labour market needs of immigrant women. The first provides cross-cultural interpretation of existing employment opportunities to Southeast Asian refugees; the second provides assistance to immigrants who face barriers to utilizing traditional resources for small business assistance. Together the projects represent less than $425,000 (0.6 per cent) of expenditure under the **Innovations** program.[42]

The remaining components of CJS — **Community Futures**, **Skill Investment**, and **Skill Shortages** — could have a peripheral impact on the employment needs of immigrant women but are in no way targetted to address their special needs. **Community Futures** provides small business development support to needy communities outside metropolitan areas (where relatively few immigrant women reside). The **Skill Investment** program is aimed at workers threatened by technological or market changes. In 1986-1987, 37 per cent of participants in the program were women.[43] It is difficult to determine the impact of this program on immigrant women specifically. **Skill Shortages** provides support to employers facing problems in locating specified high-skilled workers, through the provision of incremental training or relocation assistance. In 1986-1987, only 8.2 per cent of the participants in **Skill Shortages** were women, and the participation of immigrant women is unknown.[44] In an effort to increase the participation of women and other groups, in September 1986 the federal government introduced a new measure whereby assistance could be restricted to target groups (women, natives, visible minorities, and the disabled) in designated occupations, if a shortage of target group members is identified

by employers as a result of employment equity plans. To date, however, there have been no examples of occupations which have been restricted to women or visible minorities.

There does not appear to be any program in the CJS which is specifically designed to de-ghettoize low-skilled immigrant women. First, the women who work in such occupations often do not have the language skills necessary to participate in the training programs, since these are offered only in the official languages. Second, the training allowances are not overly generous and, as there is no guarantee that a training-related job will be available upon completion of the course, workers may believe they will be better off remaining in their present job.

Access to CJS programs is made more difficult for all immigrant women by the absence of child care associated with such programs. Even though participants may be eligible for a dependant care allowance, up to a maximum of $16.00 per day for each of the first two dependants, and less for additional dependants, information about the existence of these programs does not always reach those women who would be qualified to participate.

The process by which CJS expenditures are allocated is flawed by the absence of guarantees of input from immigrant and visible minority women. Initially, a block of funds is assigned to each region of the country and then allocated to Canada Employment Centres (CECs) representing local labour markets. To facilitate the final allocation of funds between various programs and projects, CEC managers are required to consult with Local Advisory Councils.[45] The composition of these Councils across Canada in terms of representation of women, visible minorities, immigrants, community service, and non-profit organizations is unknown; no membership criteria with respect to the participation of these groups appear to have been formally established. The ACIVMW has noted that participation of immigrant and visible minority women on Local Advisory Councils is not ensured.[46]

At the stage of selecting individuals for various training courses, local officials are instructed to conform to employment equity targets and priorities. Although the achievement of targets is monitored internally, a full discussion of the impact of CJS programs on participants will not be publicly available until late 1987.

Programs designed to improve the employment opportunities of immigrant women must address their specific needs. The barriers of being a female, often lacking fluency in either official language, being a visible minority and/or a low-skill worker cannot be counteracted by existing programs and policies which rely on, and are designed to, address these barriers individually rather than concomitantly. The recently announced program changes described above signal the government's recognition of this weakness in current training programs. It will be important to evaluate the actual impact of the restructured CJS programs on immigrant women in the future.

**Credentials**

Lack of recognition of non-Canadian educational qualifications and work experience is an area of great concern to immigrants, and lies primarily within provincial jurisdiction. This issue, of course, is relevant not only to immigrant women but also to immigrant men, and is particularly acute for immigrants with qualifications from anywhere other than Europe or North America. Labour market skills and training constitute important criteria for admission of immigrants — at least in the Independent Class; therefore, it is especially frustrating and often seems unfair to immigrants when their achievements are not recognized by Canadian employers and associations. The implications are both obvious and serious. Underemployment or unemployment can result from a lack of information as to how to judge the equivalency of non-Canadian degrees, training, and experience. Ill-informed potential employers are unlikely to take the chance of assuming equivalency, particularly if an alternative applicant with Canadian or American qualifications exists. Many self-policing professional associations require that members meet specific standards they have devised, before they will grant licenses or certificates allowing individuals

to practise their given profession. This problem is particularly significant in the health professions.

Measurement of the extent of the accreditation problem and range of occupations affected is difficult. Individual cases periodically receive media attention. In the absence of comprehensive survey data, a census analysis conducted by Trovato and Grindstaff provides a tentative indication of the magnitude of the problem.[47] The authors isolated data on the education, occupation, and income of foreign and Canadian-born ever-married women thirty years of age. They found women who migrated to Canada as adults were much more likely to have university training than were non-immigrant women (29 per cent compared to 17 per cent). Yet, these immigrant women were less likely to be in a professional job than were non-immigrant women (24 per cent compared to 33 per cent).[48] Trovato and Grindstaff speculate one cause of this discrepancy between educational attainment and occupational advantage could be problems with credentials in Canada. The authors suggested that discrimination in the job market and the time lag experienced by immigrant women in finding a position commensurate with their training are other possible explanations of these findings.

Recently, in Ontario, the Cabinet Committee on Race Relations commissioned Abt Associates of Canada to prepare a report on access to trades and professions. The study was to "identify entry requirements for the trades and professions which appear as barriers for those trained outside of Canada and which have a disproportionately negative impact on members of minority or ethnic groups".[49] On the basis of the findings of the study, which are summarized below, the Ontario government has decided to proceed with Phase II of the project, which will examine the particular barriers in each profession in greater detail. Phase II is expected to be completed in 1988.[50]

On the basis of contact with immigrant organizations and individuals, the study's authors determined that medicine and teaching were the professions most frequently perceived to pose accreditation barriers for immigrants. Respondents were less familiar with entry barriers in the skilled trades.

Immigrant respondents to the authors' survey were also asked to describe the nature of barriers to entry in the identified professions. Academic credentials were mentioned as a barrier for several reasons. The requirement that immigrants provide original certificates and/or transcripts is impossible for many people, notably refugees. Translation and interpretation of foreign credential documents which are obtained is also a problem. The Ontario government does provide translation services, but these are not always adequate. Finally, immigrants have difficulty establishing the equivalency of their credentials. Some reported that the evaluation services used by the Ministry of Education and the University of Toronto "sharply de-value" foreign credentials.

A second barrier to entry in the professions flows directly from the failure to grant equivalency for foreign credentials, discussed above. Immigrants are directed to take re-training or upgrading courses which are generally quite rigorous and may amount to a repetition of entire degrees. Many cannot afford to be without means of support during this retraining period.

The authors of the Abt report also undertook a review of the entry processes of 25 professions regulated by professional organizations as an alternative method of identifying barriers. With regard to the issue of credentials and determination of equivalency, the authors found that some professional organizations use objective evaluating exams. However, the majority rely on subjective methods "in the absence of objective controls or a systematic external review of validity".[51] These methods include case-by-case review of documents, personal interviews, and correspondence with schools and certifying bodies overseas. This process is vulnerable to bias.

The authors make several recommendations but stress that their findings are tentative, since sources of information were poor and often contradictory. They suggest:

> . . . that entry processes would be improved by adopting a method of assessing academic qualifications that is objective and blind to gender, race and ethnicity. Both immigrant groups and professional organizations identified two possible responses: a central repository of information

> on degrees and equivalencies; (and) an evaluating examination.[52]

Immigrants are not demanding equivalency in every instance and neither do employers always discount non-Canadian degrees and training, but neither party has access to a mutually acceptable body or means by which the nature and extent of equivalency may be measured. The Action Committee on Immigrant and Visible Minority Women recommended the following course of action in a submission to the Minister of Employment and Immigration in 1986:

> We are asking Employment and Immigration to work with provincial educational institutions and professional trades associations to establish the equivalency of various courses offered in other countries.[53]

Efforts have been made for some time to try to resolve the problem of recognition of credentials. Since 1979, the Council of Ministers of Education in Canada (CMEC),[54] in conjunction with the Department of External Affairs, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC), among others, has been coordinating efforts to arrive at agreements which would allow Canada to accede to the UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees concerning Higher Education in the States belonging to the Europe Region. (Canada belongs to the Europe Region.)

The Convention requires that countries acceding to the Convention either have, or are going to put in place, a mechanism for meeting its objectives. The CMEC is presently engaged in negotiations for the establishment of a commission which will be comprised of persons across the country from the registrarial community. Although decisions of the commission will not be legally binding, the fact that decisions will be based largely upon the knowledge and advice of academic registrars cannot but enhance both the quality and credence of those decisions. Although self-governing autonomous professional bodies such as the Canadian Medical Association and the Law Societies have not yet been approached for consultation, the CMEC expects to request their input and cooperation once the commission is operational.[55]

The commission is presently envisaged as a kind of clearinghouse for information, advice, and recommendations respecting academic qualifications and standards. The heaviest users will likely be university and college selection committees, but the commission will be able to advise on equivalency ratings of immigrants' and potential immigrants' qualifications acquired outside of Canada. Although the UNESCO Convention Canada will accede to is that covering the "European Region", the CMEC expects that conventions governing the other UNESCO "regions" will soon be in place, and is confident serious consideration will be given to acceding to those conventions.[56] Credentials from countries not part of UNESCO's "Europe Region" may be submitted to the commission for a decision even though formal conventions have not been acceded to.

The benefits of Canada's accession to the UNESCO Convention, however, will be realized only if the commission's services are utilized. Immigrants should be informed both at posts abroad and once in Canada of the commission's role. It has the potential to reduce some of the difficulties immigrants now face regarding the recognition of their qualifications. However, most self-governing professional bodies may be expected to retain their own means of licensing and accreditation and concerned groups will have to continue to press these associations to either coordinate their standards with those of the commission or develop equivalency ratings with their counterparts internationally.

The significance of the issue of recognition of credentials should not be underestimated. Many immigrants are granted entry to Canada as residents by Canadian officials based largely on their perceived labour market value. If that assessment does not bear up to the realities of the labour market, partially because qualifications are often not recognized, the impact on the immigrant's expectations and choices is profound.

Recent changes to the form of counselling for immigrating physicians provide a good illustration of the issue. In the past, immigrant physicians were required to sign a statement acknowledging that the issuance of an immigrant visa in no way assured them of their eventual acceptance into their profession, and that they might encounter difficulties in obtaining an opportunity to

upgrade their qualifications should this be necessary. Foreign doctors in Canada, faced with a very serious lack of access to the profession, criticized the counselling they had received as being neither emphatic nor clear enough. The policy was recently changed so that immigrating physicians must now acknowledge, among other restrictions, that "there are virtually no opportunities to acquire further medical training in Canada leading to licensure".[57] Clearly, this information is vital to the prospective immigrant physician. It is a matter of fairness and good policy, particularly when criteria related to the labour market are used as part of the screening and selection process for immigration.

Beyond the issue of informing immigrant physicians of the dearth of employment opportunities in Canada, there remains the more immediate problem of dealing in a fair manner with the many immigrant physicians now residing in Canada but unable to practise their profession. It is estimated that at any one time there are approximately 700 Canadian citizen and permanent resident graduates of foreign medical schools who are seeking internship positions in Canada; 400 are resident in Ontario, 150 in Quebec, and the remainder in other provinces.[58]

In Quebec, there were 582 internships available in 1986, of which 30 were reserved for foreign graduates. In Ontario, the number of internships reserved for foreign graduates was reduced in 1986 from 60 to 24 out of a total of 733.[59] A group of Polish-trained doctors recently challenged the province of Ontario in court, claiming the restriction placed on internships abrogates their rights under the Charter. In the Supreme Court of Ontario, J. Hughes ruled against the doctors by finding that, although the legislation governing internships is discriminatory, its purpose is reasonable and outweighs its adverse effect. This case is currently under appeal.[60]

**Child Care**

Child care is an important issue for all Canadians; however, because women continue to bear primary responsibility for the care of preschool-age children, it is a policy area which is most often addressed as a women's issue.

Child care has assumed more significance on the public policy agenda as women's labour force participation rates have increased. While child care is a major concern of all Canadian-born women, it assumes an even greater significance for immigrant women for two reasons. First, as already noted, the rate of participation in the labour force tends overall to be higher for foreign-born women than for Canadian-born women; and second, immigrant children's needs are often quite different from those of Canadian-born children.

Foreign-born women are not only more likely to work than are Canadian-born women, but, as discussed earlier in this paper, recent immigrants are more likely to work in low-wage service and manufacturing occupations. In these occupations, women have little control over their shifts and working conditions.[61] Affordable, flexible, and accessible child care is a necessity for these women. As discussed in the second section of this paper, many of the immigrant women who become homeworkers in the garment industry, and are subject to the very low wages, long hours, and poor conditions associated with homeworking, do so because they have small children at home and either cannot afford, or do not have access to child care.

As indicated in the discussion of language training, many immigrant women have access only to Secretary of State language training programs. These programs are often offered on a part-time basis in the evenings, or, alternatively, are offered during the day when women working outside the home cannot attend. Women who work in the home cannot generally bring their children with them to classes, although some programs include child-care arrangements. For example, in Ontario, in 1985-86, approximately 120 of the 355 language training programs offered by the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture included some form of multicultural preschool child care to the children of women and men participating in the programs.[62] As discussed earlier, CEIC does make some provision in the area; for example, immigrants participating in language training courses are eligible for a dependant care allowance. Parents, however, have indicated a desire for on-site child care or for high-quality care established and monitored by the federal government at or near the training centres.[63] In addition to the child-care needs of parents attending skills and/or language training classes, parents looking for work also need reliable child care.

Problems of access to child care and to available subsidies are compounded for immigrant parents facing a language barrier. "Most child care programs and related documentation are provided only in English or French and very rarely are interpreters available."[64] Parents may not be aware that they qualify for subsidized care, or they may have difficulty getting subsidized care because of a lack of familiarity with the process of applying for assistance.

Culturally specific child care is often an important consideration for immigrant parents. Preschool children may not be exposed to either official language until they begin to attend school regularly. Obviously, this linguistic isolation can put these children at a disadvantage in the classroom. Further, "even if they are familiar with one of the official languages, the child care experience can be useful in familiarizing them with Canadian expressions, word connotations, values, holidays and customs".[65] Such programs can expose children to Canada's languages and customs without submerging the child's own cultural identity and heritage. Witnesses before the Special Committee on Child Care argued that federal multicultural policies are not reaching very young children. "Most child care programs reflect the dominant culture through their choice of games, foods, holiday-related activities, stories and nursery rhymes."[66]

The significance of the rationale behind the need for culturally sensitive child care should not be underestimated. As Mock has indicated: "Ethnic identity is an integral part of the child's self-concept; to ignore or erase cultural ties can only lower the child's self-esteem. The teacher who is sensitive to the emotional needs of the children and who creates an environment where every child experiences security and a sense of belonging, is well on the way to ensure favourable self-concepts and best possible learning."[67] Currently, most provinces have few requirements or facilities to ensure that early childhood educators are prepared to meet the demands of teaching in a multicultural society. Beginning in 1981, immigrant women's action groups have been recommending specialized training of child-care staff to work with immigrant children.[68]

A 1977 survey of users of child-care services in Metropolitan Toronto found that the children of immigrant parents were not always receiving the type of child care their parents would have preferred. Although sitter care was the most common type of care used by both Canadian-born and foreign-born parents, Canadian-born parents were more likely to use a child-care centre than were immigrant parents. Immigrant parents were much more likely to rely upon care by a resident relative.[69]

When the same parents were asked what their ideal day-care arrangement would be for a child of three years, differences between foreign-born and Canadian-born parents almost disappeared. Most parents showed a distinct preference for care in a child-care centre as opposed to care by a sitter. Of the Canadian-born families surveyed, 77.4 per cent preferred centre care; 81.2 per cent of the foreign-born families preferred this type of care.[70]

The recent report of the House of Commons Special Committee on Child Care, *Sharing the Responsibility*, recognizes both the particular needs of immigrant parents, and the concept of multicultural child care. The report recommends the following:

> (32) We recommend that Employment and Immigration Canada re-examine its present policy regarding child care services under the Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Program with a view to determining current effectiveness from the perspective of the new Canadian family, including emphasis on the provision of child care services for at-home parents taking language courses.
>
> (33) We recommend that the Minister of State for Multiculturalism promote the development and exchange of preschool multicultural programs and materials, as well as greater use of existing child care expertise in cultural communities.
>
> (34) We recommend that the Minister of State for Multiculturalism explore with the provinces and territories mechanisms for developing culturally sensitive early childhood programs.[71]

In addition, elsewhere in the report, the Committee has recommended that a new secretariat be established within Health and Welfare Canada to administer the proposed Family and Child Care Act, which would, among other things, ". . . work with the public, private and non-profit sectors to encourage initiatives in the field of child care, including . . . enhancing the development and quality of services such as: . . . preschool multicultural resources and culturally sensitive early childhood programs".[72]

Although at the time of writing the federal government has yet to table a comprehensive response to the specific recommendations of the March 1987 report (an interim response was tabled on July 28, 1987), it has demonstrated a certain level of commitment to improving the status of child care in Canada generally and, to a lesser extent, is committed to recognizing the need for and the importance of culturally sensitive child care. It will be critically important to continue to articulate the particular concerns of immigrant women during the legislative process, to ensure that the issues discussed above are adequately addressed, and the recommendations implemented.

## DOMESTIC WORKERS IN CANADA[73]

The first three sections of this paper have concentrated on immigrants who entered Canada as permanent residents. However, a significant number of foreign-born women in Canada also enter as temporary workers, and the majority of these workers are domestics in private homes. Historically, most domestics came from the United Kingdom, but since the 1970s, large numbers have come from the Caribbean and most recently from the Philippines.

In the past, most domestics entered Canada as permanent residents, but since the introduction of the Canadian employment authorization program[74] in 1973, more and more domestics have entered Canada as temporary workers. In 1973, 50.2 per cent of all migrants entering Canada as domestic service workers were females with landed status, whereas females with temporary employment authorizations represented 46.8 per cent of all domestic workers. By 1981, only

5.5 per cent of domestic workers were females with landed or permanent resident status. A full 87.9 per cent were females with temporary work permits who would at some point be asked to return to their country of origin. (Throughout this 1973-1981 period, males comprised between 1.6 and 6.5 per cent of all domestic workers.)[75] The major reason for the dramatic change in entry class of domestic workers was that it had become much easier to gain admission to Canada as a temporary worker in a selected occupation on an employment authorization, than it was to gain admission under the point system which would lead to permanent resident status. At that time, securing landing (permanent resident status) from within Canada was discretionary and extremely difficult to obtain.[76]

The increasing proportion of domestic workers with temporary status as opposed to landed status indicated an already marginalized group of workers had become more so. This situation was acknowledged by a 1981 Task Force Report on Domestic Workers on Employment Authorizations. Therein, the essence of the problem created by the 1973 authorization program was stated as follows: ". . . the employment authorization device serves to maintain the supply of domestics by restricting their mobility. As presently administered, however, it also serves to inhibit the type of improvement in wages and working conditions which might ultimately attract Canadians to these jobs and reduce the need for foreign workers."[77] The Task Force put forward a number of proposals to deal with the problem and ultimately recommended that employment authorizations continue to be made available to foreign domestic workers, provided that their opportunities for entry as permanent residents be broadened.[78]

In November 1981, the federal government issued a revised policy with respect to domestic workers, generally referred to as the Foreign Domestic Worker Program or the Foreign Domestic Movement. The revised policy established new criteria and new opportunities for domestics within the employment authorization program.[79]

The fundamental change brought about by the Foreign Domestic Movement was that domestics who entered Canada on temporary employment authorizations would now be able to apply for permanent resident status after

two years in Canada, and could do so from within Canada. The criteria by which they would be assessed would include: potential for financial self-sufficiency; continuous employment in Canada; upgrading of language capability, education, and occupational skills; likelihood of financial hardship in the event of family reunification in Canada; and adaptation to the Canadian lifestyle and local community.[80] Employment authorizations are therefore no longer issued solely on the basis of validated demand and the domestic's ability to do the job. Rather, applicants for temporary entry to Canada must now demonstrate "reasonable prospects for long-term self-sufficiency and permanent resident status, if they are given the opportunity to upgrade their skills while working in Canada for a period of two years".[81]

After a domestic has worked in Canada for a period of one year, the temporary employment authorization must be renewed. At the time of renewal, immigration officers carry out a preliminary assessment of the applicant's progress toward achieving landed status. Most temporary authorizations are renewed at this point and assessed again the following year to determine whether landing from within Canada is appropriate.

Other policy changes instituted under the Foreign Domestic Movement include the following: a requirement that employers and domestics sign a written agreement setting out duties and conditions of employment, a requirement that employers provide three hours off per week and a maximum of $20 per month toward domestics' upgrading of skills, and a requirement that the services of Canada Employment Centres be extended to domestic workers on temporary authorizations.[82]

Since its inception to the end of 1985, the program has processed 8,387 workers as permanent residents. Of these, 78 per cent of the domestics were processed from within Canada, while the remaining 22 per cent were processed from abroad and landed upon entry to Canada.[83] Table 11 provides information on the "success rate" achieved by domestics seeking landing from within Canada. On average, between 1982 and 1985, 62.6 per cent of the 11,019 requests were accepted, 4.4 per cent were rejected, and 19.2 per cent were furthered for training. The remaining 20.3 per cent were on hold. The figures

in Table 11 may not be entirely accurate; they are presented here as an indication of general trends.[84]

**TABLE 11 DOMESTICS SEEKING LANDING FROM WITHIN CANADA[a]**

| | 1982[b] | % Distribution | 1983 | % Distribution | 1984 | % Distribution | 1985 | % Distribution | Total | % Distribution |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Requests received | 3,337 | -- | 3,041 | -- | 2,122 | -- | 1,196 | -- | 11,019[c] | -- |
| Requests accepted | 1,189 | -- | 2,317 | -- | 1,976 | -- | 1,421 | -- | 6,903 | -- |
| Requests rejected[d] | 27 | 0.8 | 119 | 3.9 | 149 | 7.0 | 188 | 15.7 | 483 | 4.4 |
| Furthered for training | 1,057 | 31.7 | 546 | 18.0 | 302 | 14.2 | 207 | 17.3 | 2,112 | 19.2 |
| On hold | 163 | 4.9 | 1,038 | 34.1 | 569 | 26.8 | 463 | 38.7 | 2,233 | 20.3 |

Source: Extracted from: Canada, Employment and Immigration, Policy and Program Development Branch, *Foreign Domestic Movement. Statistical Highlight 1985* (Ottawa: June 1986), Table 5.

Notes:
(a) See note 84 for explanation regarding discrepancies in data.
(b) November 1981 to December 1982.
(c) Data Collection: The figure indicated as "Total requests received" is not equal to the sum of requests received from 1982 through 1985, as would be expected. In the province of Alberta, there were a total of 1,323 requests received over the entire period. These requests are included in the "total" figure but cannot be allocated by year because of poor data collection procedures in that province. Only 70 of the requests received in Alberta are accounted for in the remaining categories, i.e., accepted, rejected, furthered for training, or on hold.
(d) The requests rejected are among the only figures in Table 11 **not** subject to double counting. A request rejected is rejected on the day application is made and therefore will not be double counted in any other category. The rejection rate is calculated as the ratio of requests rejected to requests received. Note that the per cent distribution, or rejection rate, will be **understated** if requests received is overstated.

While the proportion accepted appears reasonably high, the fact that a number were rejected or furthered for training suggests that problems may exist which prevent domestics from meeting the criteria for admission as

permanent residents. Specifically, low wages may make it difficult for them to demonstrate financial independence, or inadequate opportunity for training may have prevented them from upgrading their skills. These, in turn, could be associated with failure of employers to comply with the conditions of the agreement, as described above. Each of these potential problems is discussed below.

Wages paid to domestics vary across Canada. A "validation wage" is established by each regional CEIC office on the basis of prevailing wage rates and the rate of pay thought to be necessary to attract Canadians to domestic work. A domestic worker enters Canada on the understanding that she/he will be paid the validation wage. As noted above, this wage and other working conditions are stipulated in an agreement signed by the domestic and employer. This wage may be equal to, or greater than, the minimum wage for domestics established by provincial labour standards legislation.

Enforcement of the wages and working conditions stipulated in the agreement is more complex once the foreign domestic is actually working in Canada. The federal government does not investigate domestic working conditions in a systematic manner, but will investigate complaints brought to the attention of Canada Employment Centres by individual domestics. Actual enforcement of labour standards is within the constitutional jurisdiction of the provinces. Therefore, domestic workers have sought to establish favourable wages and working conditions within provincial labour standards legislation, since this is their only legal recourse once in Canada. A review of provincial legislation (Appendix 1) reveals that wages and working conditions vary greatly across Canada and, in many instances, are not adequate to achieve financial self-sufficiency. In Ontario and British Columbia, domestic workers are pursuing court challenges to employment standards legislation under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, on the grounds that legislation denies domestics the protection accorded other workers.

The failure of the federal government to systematically enforce the domestic-employer agreement means that employers may not adhere to the condition that time and financial assistance be given to domestics to engage

in language and skills upgrading. Although domestics are instructed to report all breaches of the employment agreement to a Canada Immigration Centre, many believe employers' claims that they can be deported for "causing trouble". As a result, many domestics continue to work long hours for low pay and are denied the right to time off and a token contribution from the employer toward the cost of upgrading. Domestics on employment authorizations who leave or are fired from their employment may receive approval to work elsewhere for the duration of their work permit if the termination of employment is brought about by "circumstances beyond the control of the worker".[85]

The combination of uneven employment standards legislation in different provinces and failure to enforce employment agreements presents a barrier to the domestic who must demonstrate financial self-sufficiency to qualify for permanent resident status. The International Coalition to End Domestics' Exploitation (INTERCEDE) has met with the Honourable Gerry Weiner, the Minister of State for Immigration, to discuss these and other concerns.[86] Two of the major issues raised by INTERCEDE illustrate the need to assess the Foreign Domestic Worker Program more rigorously.

First, INTERCEDE is alarmed by the rising rejection rate of applications for landing from within Canada (4 per cent in 1983, 7 per cent in 1984, and 16 per cent in 1985). INTERCEDE suspects a disproportionate number of those rejected were visible minority women. The Minister has requested departmental officials to retrieve demographic information on domestics rejected for landing over a four-year period to facilitate an analysis of the reasons for the rising rate and of possible discrimination.

Second, regarding contract enforcement, INTERCEDE has made a recommendation for spot checks on employers to determine whether provisions for pay, time off, and contribution toward upgrading are being respected. In addition, the employers of domestics who fail their first assessment for landing could be issued reminders of their obligation to provide three hours per week and $20.00 per month toward upgrading. Foreign domestics have repeated their demand for better pay. In Ontario, for example, a live-in domestic received an

average gross pay of $7,208 in 1986 after deductions for room and board and excluding overtime.[87]

A revision of the Foreign Domestic Movement is currently underway. A copy of the revised procedures for the selection and counselling of foreign domestics, in draft format, was generously provided to the authors in August 1987 by the Policy and Program Development Branch of Employment and Immigration. The following comments on the revised procedures are offered in the spirit of constructive criticism, at a time when the procedures are under discussion within the department.

The most significant changes in the revised procedures, compared to those currently outlined in the Immigration Manual, pertain to the criteria used in selecting domestics for both employment authorizations and landing. Selection criteria for temporary entry are more restrictive; criteria for landing have been relaxed.[88] Applicants would be selected for temporary entry on the basis of: formal training or experience, ability to communicate orally and in writing in either French or English, personal qualities, and family configuration. Assessment for landing would be based on the following factors: satisfactory work history, adequate financial management, initiative toward upgrading in certain cases only, and contacts in the community and traits required for successful establishment in Canada.

Admission criteria have been made less ambiguous, presumably to ensure *a priori* that the potential for those on temporary authorizations to achieve landing is great. While any revision intended to make selection more systematic and less subjective is to be encouraged, in two respects the proposed selection criteria for temporary entry could have a disproportionately negative impact on certain types of applicants.

First, according to the revised selection procedures, applicants must now show "**evidence** of either formal training in the domestic and/or childcare field or sufficient experience (minimum one-year full-time **paid** employment as a domestic to compensate for a lack of formal training)".[89] (emphasis added) This change in selection criteria is apparently intended to ensure that the

applicant is, on the basis of qualifications and work experience, a professional domestic or nanny. The revised procedures stress that the program is not intended to serve as a conduit for individuals trained in other professions, or for individuals without the skills relevant to domestic work. This recognition of the specialized skills and contribution of domestic workers is long overdue and could contribute to improved status for all domestic workers in Canada. However, the requirement for documentation of paid employment could have a disproportionately negative impact on women from developing nations, whose wages are frequently paid informally by employers.

Second, the stated justification for the new language ability requirement is the desire to ensure that domestics have the ". . . ability to properly react in circumstances of emergency and be able to secure proper assistance for the children in their care . . ."[90] To put this requirement into context and to evaluate the probable impact it will have on applicants, it would be necessary to analyse the linguistic ability of former successful participants in the Foreign Domestic Movement. Unfortunately, such information is not publicly available. An examination of the linguistic ability of female landed immigrants does, however, suggest that large numbers of foreign domestics currently working in Canada could not have secured admission under the new criteria.

In an earlier section of this paper (see "Knowledge of Official Languages") it was revealed that large numbers of landed immigrants have no ability in English or French. Presumably, a significantly greater number would be unable to meet the more stringent requirement for written ability. The language criterion contained in the revised procedures of the Foreign Domestic Movement might therefore restrict participation in the program of women from certain areas of the world where English or French are not normally spoken. Relative to the actual needs of Canadian employers, the requirement may be too rigorous; relative to the needs of Canadian employers who do not speak English or French at home, it is even less justified.[91]

The primary condition for landing has been the domestic's record of two years continuous employment in Canada. The revised procedures clarify that although letters of reference are not mandatory to verify a satisfactory

employment history, they can assist the officer conducting the evaluation. The former requirement for financial self-sufficiency has been realistically revised to require a demonstration by the domestic of adequate financial management of earnings, expenses, and financial responsibilities. Officers are cautioned in the revised procedures to discontinue the past practice of requesting that dependants of domestics show evidence of job offers in Canada if they are contemplating immigration.

In revisions to the criteria for landing, an effort has been made to correct the current impression that all domestics are expected to upgrade their skills while in Canada. Given the requirement for documented training or experience upon temporary entry, upgrading will only be suggested by employment counsellors to some domestics. It is explicit in the new procedures that changes in initial selection criteria were made to ensure participants in the program would be likely to remain in domestic work upon landing.

In summary, it would appear that the overall effect of the revised procedures, if implemented, would be to admit domestic workers who are more highly qualified and experienced, and who have good official language skills. This, in turn, would probably ensure higher success rates for domestics seeking landing, but could exclude certain groups from developing countries. The procedures also seem to be designed to encourage workers to stay in domestic occupations after landing. While this is understandable, given the shortage of domestic workers in Canada, it could exacerbate the ghettoization of immigrant women in low-wage sectors of the labour force. Given this, it would seem critically important that further efforts be made — particularly at the provincial level — to improve the wages and working conditions of domestics.

## CONCLUSION

Based on a number of economic measures, immigrant women, on average, seem to be doing better than Canadian-born women. They have higher incomes, higher rates of labour force participation, and lower rates of

unemployment than their Canadian-born counterparts. These averages, however, are very misleading, given the great heterogeneity which characterizes the female immigrant population.

As we have seen, immigrant women in the labour force tend to be located at the top and bottom of the occupational scale. Even the most advantaged of these women, who are highly educated and skilled, are frequently faced with problems of recognition of their credentials. Even more serious are the problems of those large numbers of immigrant women located at the lowest rungs of the occupational ladder.

One of the most disadvantaged demographic groups in Canadian society is comprised of relatively recent arrivals of immigrant women from Southern Europe and Asia. Characterized by limited education and job-related skills, frequently lacking knowledge of either official language, and requiring employment income to help support their families, these women have little option but to seek employment in ethnic-linguistic job ghettos such as the clothing industry. In such industries, they are faced with low wages, poor working conditions, and job insecurity; as well, they are in a very weak position to press for improvements.

Perversely, these are the women who are least assisted by government programs and policies. For a number of reasons, they are frequently not eligible, or are unable to take advantage of, government-sponsored language training programs. This, in turn, decreases their chances of learning an official language and thereby gaining access to the government's employment and skills training programs. Frequently, immigrant women's choices with respect to employment and their inability to take advantage of training courses is related to their child-care responsibilities, and the absence of affordable, accessible, and culturally sensitive child care outside the home.

Domestic workers who enter Canada on temporary employment authorizations are also disadvantaged. While major improvements were introduced with the Foreign Domestic Movement in 1981, problems remain because the

conditions of work and pay are not systematically monitored or enforced, and considerable differences in provincial legislation exist across the country.

As we have seen, it is not only immigrant women in the labour force and foreign domestic workers who are faced with difficulties. Women who work in the home are not eligible for CEIC language training courses, and their status — which is frequently sponsored — makes it difficult for them to obtain social services which may become essential in situations of marital breakdown or violence.

What can be done by the federal government to improve the situation of immigrant women and foreign domestic workers in Canada? To a great extent the problems of disadvantaged migrants are related to broader economic, structural, and social issues. For example, the poor working conditions and pay in industries such as clothing are closely related to the competitive disadvantage of the Canadian industry vis-à-vis Third World countries. Therefore, government intervention in the areas of industrial policy and trade policy assumes importance. Also, the difficulties faced by domestic workers and by immigrant women who work in the home is related to the generally low status of work which is often associated with child care and domestic activities. While it is not within the scope of this paper to address these broader issues, it is important to recognize their significance.

Within the context of the policies discussed in this paper, a number of specific proposals emerge, which, taken together, could assist migrant women by making them more mobile in the labour force, and by making them less isolated and dependent in the home. These proposals are considered under the appropriate headings as follows:

**Class of Entry**

While sponsorship within Family Class and as Assisted Relatives in the Independent Class facilitates entry for many persons, it can lead to dependency and limited access to government-sponsored programs and services.

Women planning to immigrate to Canada should be informed about the implications of sponsorship, and should also be made aware of economic conditions in Canada which may require them to work for pay.

**Language Training**

Capacity to speak one of the official languages is perhaps the most powerful determinant of occupational status and mobility, as well as success in social adaptation. Lack of access to CEIC language training is particularly damaging for women in low-skill, low-wage jobs. In principle, all women should have access to language training, regardless of class of entry, employment status, or type of occupation. Ideally, such training would be fully subsidized, with provision for child care and other allowances; and would be provided in a variety of ways — full-time and part-time, in communities, schools, and at the workplace. It is hoped that the CEIC/Secretary of State reviews of language training programs will address these issues.

**Employment Training and Skills Upgrading**

If language training were improved, more immigrant women would be able to gain access to employment and skills training offered by the various programs within the Canadian Jobs Strategy. However, at least until recently, a number of other eligibility requirements have been problematic, particularly those requiring that immigrant women be unemployed for specified periods of time. These types of criteria reflect the failure of the CJS to treat concomitantly the difficulties associated with being a female, an immigrant, and frequently a member of an ethnic minority. The recent announcement of changes in the eligibility criteria for certain programs is very encouraging. It will be essential to carefully monitor the impact of these changes on the participation of immigrant women.

**Credentials**

Lack of recognition of credentials can result in unemployment and underemployment of skilled immigrant women. While the issue of recognition of credentials falls primarily within provincial jurisdiction, there is some scope for action at the federal level. First, there is a need for more rigorous counselling of potential immigrants regarding the constraints they may face with respect to recognition of their credentials. Second, the Council of Ministers of Education continues to coordinate efforts to ensure Canadian participation in the UNESCO Convention, and this could be of some benefit to immigrants. However, the more difficult problem relates to the requirements of professional bodies such as the Canadian Medical Association. Since the latter is a matter of provincial jurisdiction in the health field, the posing of policy proposals falls outside the scope of this paper. However, one must raise the question of whether the health-care needs of an increasingly multicultural society are being met if there is such severe lack of access of foreign doctors to the medical profession. In view of the increasing number of immigrants from developing countries with limited knowledge of either official language, one can see the advantage of having more foreign doctors who can assist patients within the context of their own language and cultural values. A major challenge will be to resolve the conflict between the desirability of a multicultural medical community in Canada, and the fact that medical training, procedures, and standards do vary from country to country.

**Child Care**

The availability of adequate and accessible child care influences immigrant women's labour force participation, the type of employment which they take, and their capacity to take advantage of language and other training. There is increasing awareness of the need for improved child care not only for immigrants but for all Canadian families. Furthermore, very useful recommendations have been made in the report of the House of Commons Special Committee on Child Care, entitled *Sharing the Responsibility*, regarding the

need for culturally sensitive child care. It is hoped that these recommendations will be incorporated in the development of a national strategy for child care.

**Domestic Workers**

The introduction of the Foreign Domestic Movement in 1981 broadened the nature of the policy issues of relevance to domestics on employment authorizations. Prior to 1981, the key issues were working conditions and pay — which were largely within provincial jurisdiction. These issues remain important today. However, as a result of the Foreign Domestic Movement, which entitles domestics to seek permanent status after two years in Canada, policy issues regarding language and skills training have assumed greater significance, since improvements in language and other skills are criteria by which domestics seeking permanent status are assessed. As discussed earlier in this paper, a revision of procedures for the selection and counselling of foreign domestics is currently underway. If implemented, these revisions would place more explicit emphasis on previous training and on work and language skills as criteria for initial admission. By implication, language and skills upgrading within Canada would assume less importance. While selecting more highly skilled domestics for initial entry into Canada might increase the proportion of successful applicants seeking landing, the more stringent admission criteria might exclude certain groups of women, especially those from countries where English or French are not commonly spoken. Furthermore, after domestics have achieved permanent status, other types of policy concerns such as the adequacy of child care will also become relevant.

In summary, there is considerable scope for the improvement of the socio-economic status of migrant women in Canada. The above policy proposals would assist in this process by improving the language and employment skills, occupational mobility, and working conditions of immigrant women and foreign domestic workers.

However, as discussed earlier, there is great diversity within the female migrant population. Very little is known about the characteristics and needs of particular migrant groups, such as recent refugee arrivals on the one hand, and professional and business women on the other. Lack of knowledge about these different groups hinders further policy development. This points to the need for further research, as elaborated in Appendix 2. Equally important, there is a need for active consultation with immigrant women and groups, in order to refine further the policy directions suggested above, and to set the stage for a continuing dialogue among policy analysts, government officials, and immigrant women.

## APPENDIX 1 SUMMARY OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS REGARDING DOMESTICS IN CANADA

### Ontario

The Ontario regulations are the most significant since a majority of domestics are destined for that province upon arrival in Canada. The *Employment Standards Act* defines a domestic servant as a person employed to care for a child, or as a companion to an aged, infirm or ill person. A domestic who performs other household services 24 hours a week or less is also included. Domestics were first included under minimum wage provisions in 1981. As of October 1, 1987, the minimum wage is $4.55/hour, equal to that of all other adult workers in the province. Live-out domestics are entitled to time-and-a-half for working in excess of 44 hours per week. Until recently live-in domestics were entitled to one period of 36 hours and another period of 12 hours of free time per week, but were not entitled to overtime pay at time-and-a-half. As of October 1, 1987, live-in domestics may work during their free period, with consent, with 1½ hours free time for each hour worked. In lieu of time off, live-in domestics are entitled to time-and-a-half overtime pay. Work performed in excess of 44 hours per week must also be granted overtime at the rate of 1.5 hours or 1½ times pay.

On the issue of maximum hours of work for domestics, the government has decided to defer action until the Task Force on Hours of Work and Overtime reports on domestics — this report is expected in the fall of 1987. As of October 1986, a maximum of $55.00 per week may be deducted from a live-in domestic's wages for room and board.

Domestic workers are excluded from the Ontario Labour Relations and Rights of Labour Acts and thereby have no right to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining.

**Quebec**

The definition of a "domestic" in *An Act Respecting Labour Standards* excludes an employee whose main duty is the care of a child, or of a disabled, handicapped or aged person. The minimum wage payable to a live-in domestic is $150.00 per week as of October 1, 1986. The standard work week, for the purpose of computing overtime, is 44 hours for a live-out domestic and 53 hours for a live-in domestic. Maximum allowable charge for room and board is established by regulation.

**British Columbia**

Sitters, defined as persons employed solely to attend to a child, or to a disabled, infirm or other person, are excluded from the definition of a domestic. As of February 1987, the minimum wage for live-in domestics other than "sitters" is $32.00/day. Live-in domestic workers are excluded from the overtime provisions of the *Employment Standards Act*. Live-out domestics other than "sitters" are covered by all standards.

**Alberta**

Domestic employees working in a private dwelling are exempt from minimum wage provisions.

**Saskatchewan**

Minimum wage provisions apply to domestic workers in a private home **only** where the employer is in receipt of a wage subsidy from a municipal, provincial, or federal government or a publicly funded organization. The minimum wage is $4.50/hour.

**Manitoba**

Employment standards legislation applies to domestic employees who work more than 24 hours per week for one employer but does **not** apply to persons employed to attend primarily to the needs of a child or as companion to the aged, ill or infirm. The minimum wage in Manitoba is $4.70 per hour effective September 1, 1987. Working hours for all workers in the province are limited to 12 hours per day; overtime pay is collected after the first eight hours.

A domestic worker who lives-in is entitled to at least six consecutive hours for sleeping, a reasonable time from work in order to attend to private affairs, and time off for eating meals. Maximum rates for room and board are established.

**New Brunswick**

In labour standards legislation the definition of "employee" does not include a person employed in domestic service in a private home.

**Nova Scotia**

Domestic servants in a private home are exempted from application of the *Labour Standards Code*.

**Prince Edward Island**

Persons employed for the "sole purpose of protecting and caring for children", handicapped, and aged persons in private homes are exempt from minimum wage legislation. Other domestics are entitled to a minimum wage of $4.00 per hour and $6.00/hour for a work week in excess of 48 hours.

**Newfoundland**

Domestics are entitled to a minimum wage of $2.75 per hour as of 1985. In comparison, the standard minimum wage is $4.00 per hour. Domestics employed in private homes are not entitled to overtime pay.

---

Sources: *Canadian Labour Law Reports* (Don Mills, Ontario: CCH Canadian Ltd., various issues, 1987); minimum wage data provided by Labour Canada, Bureau of Labour Information, June 8, 1987; Alma Estable, *Immigrant Women in Canada — Current Issues* (Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, March 1986); Canada, Labour Canada, Women's Bureau, *Canadian Women and Job Related Laws* (Ottawa: 1985), and Ontario, Ministry of Labour, "Overtime Pay and Other Benefits Set for Domestics", *News Release*, Toronto: June 9, 1987.

## APPENDIX 2 IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

While a number of specific initiatives can be taken by the federal government at the present time to improve the situation of immigrant women and domestic workers in Canada, much remains to be done. The further development of policy regarding migrant women is constrained, to a certain extent, by limited information about the role, status, and socio-economic impact of particular female migrant groups within our society. Research has the potential to shed light on these issues, thereby better informing policy debate. Examples of areas of research which are of particular relevance are examined below.

- Detailed analysis of the labour force activities of immigrant women, focussing both on professional, highly skilled women as well as on particularly disadvantaged groups within the service sector and in processing, fabricating, and assembly occupations. Such research would focus on the education, age, skills, and ethnic characteristics of the labour force, the working conditions and pay associated with such occupations, problems associated with credentials and accreditation and the policy measures which would facilitate occupational mobility out of ethnic-linguistic ghettos.

- The development of a detailed profile of the social, economic, and ethnic characteristics of domestic workers in Canada, including those who apply and are accepted/rejected for permanent status. The study would include an analysis of the differential treatment of domestics by province, and would discuss measures for improving the pay and working conditions associated with domestic work.

- Analysis of the incidence of poverty among immigrant women. While incomes of foreign-born women, on average, are higher than those of Canadian-born women, particular groups of immigrant women have much lower incomes or no incomes at all. These include the most recent arrivals in the country (recall Table 6). It is probable that low-income immigrants also include

older women, who have inadequate pensions. The causes of poverty in these groups would be assessed, and policy options would be considered.

- In-depth study of the role of immigrant women as entrepreneurs in small business. This is a particularly neglected area of study, but potentially significant. The analysis would focus on the socio-economic and cultural characteristics of immigrant women entrepreneurs, and would assess the operation of their businesses in terms of level of investment, employment creation, and trade.

- Analysis of the social, economic, and ethnic characteristics of recent refugees to Canada. To the extent that data permits, an assessment would be made of the economic impact of refugees, particularly in terms of their labour force participation. This is a particularly important area, given the paucity of research on the special circumstances, needs, and adaptation problems of refugee women.

- Analysis of the implications of the Constitutional Accord for the status of immigrant women in Canada. This analysis would focus on three aspects of the Accord, signed by the Prime Minister and provincial premiers on June 3, 1987. First, the Accord presents the potential for a more active role by the provinces in the determination of the number and country of origin of immigrants to each province. Commentators have suggested the result could be a patchwork of conflicting provincial immigration policies. Second, there is widespread concern that the clause on shared-cost programs will enable provinces to undermine national standards in the delivery of social programs. Programs for language training, social assistance, and child care could be negatively affected. And third, the Accord gives the provinces the right to opt out of federal immigrant reception and integration services. The potential impact of this provision on immigrant women and immigrant women's organizations must be examined.

- Analysis of the access of immigrant women to social services, with special attention to the relevance of class of immigration and to provincial variation

in the provision of services. This analysis would include a review of procedures used to establish sponsorship breakdown.

- Role of immigrant organizations. Federal funding of community agencies for provision of settlement and adaptation services has a major, though indirect, impact on the lives of immigrant women. The adequacy and effectiveness of such funding should be assessed.

- Assessment of the special challenges faced by immigrant women who are also members of visible minority groups. This would include a focus on a range of public policy issues, including labour market policies such as affirmative action. Such research would build on the work being undertaken by the National Organization of Immigrant and Visible Minority Women of Canada (NOIVMWC).

## NOTES

1. Canada, Statistics Canada, *Canada's Immigrants* (Ottawa: 1984), 1981 Census, catalogue no. 99-936.

2. Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 33rd Parliament, 2nd session (Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, August 11, 1987), p. 7912.

3. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Your Rights and Canada's Immigration Law* (Ottawa: 1986), pp. 9-10.

4. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, Policy and Program Development Branch, *Immigration Levels 1988-1990: Consultation Issues* (Ottawa: February 1987), pp. 31-32; Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, "Canada's Committment to Refugees", in *New Refugee Determination Legislation* (Ottawa: May 5, 1987), "Backgrounder D", p. 2.

5. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Your Rights and Canada's Immigration Law*, pp. 12-16.

6. This section builds on previous research focussing on the demographic and socio-economic profiles of immigrant women. Particularly relevant are:
   - Sheila McLeod Arnopoulos, *Problems of Immigrant Women in the Canadian Labour Force* (Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, January 1979);
   - Monica Boyd, "Immigrant Women in Canada", in *International Migration: The Female Experience*, ed. Rita J. Simon and Caroline Brettell (Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld, 1986);
   - Monica Boyd, *Migrant Women in Canada: Profiles and Policies*, paper prepared for the OECD Sub-panel on Migrant Women, Paris, April 6-7, 1987 (Ottawa: March 1987); and
   - Alma Estable, *Immigrant Women in Canada — Current Issues* (Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, March 1986).

7. Nancy McLaughlin, "The Labour Force Participation of Canada's Immigrants", *The Labour Force* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, September 1985), catalogue no. 71-001, pp. 100-101.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 105.

9. Canada, Secretary of State, Multiculturalism Directorate, Policy, Research and Analysis Division, *Profile of Canadians Who Speak Neither French nor English* (Ottawa: March 3, 1987), pp. 10 and 13.

10. Boyd, *Migrant Women in Canada: Profiles and Policies*, p. 14.

11. Canada, Statistics Canada, *Population. Labour Force — Occupation by Cultural Characteristics* (Ottawa: 1984), 1981 Census, catalogue no. 92-918, vol. 1, table 1, p. 39.

12. Boyd, "Immigrant Women in Canada", p. 56.

13. Canada, Textile and Clothing Board, *Report on Textiles and Clothing 1986* (Ottawa: September 30, 1986), p. 7.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 7; table 20, p. 18.

15. Carla Lipsig-Mummé, "Organizing Women in the Clothing Trades: Homework and the 1983 Garment Strike in Canada", *Studies in Political Economy*, vol. 22 (spring 1987), p. 70.

16. Laura C. Johnson and Robert E. Johnson, *The Seam Allowance: Industrial Home Sewing in Canada* (Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1982).

17. Ontario estimate by Laura C. Johnson, *The Seam Allowance*, pp. 103-104. Johnson calculated as follows: A check of classified advertisers revealed a 1:2 ratio of legal to illegal homework **firms**. There were 254 homeworker permits issued to Ontario firms in 1980. On the basis of a 1:2 ratio, these are matched by an additional 508 non-permit holders. If a permit is assumed to cover ten homeworkers, this would yield a total of 7,620 homeworkers, only 2,540 of whom are covered by official permits.

    Quebec estimate by Jennifer Robinson, *The Gazette* (Montreal), in *The Seam Allowance*, p. 110.

18. Johnson and Johnson, *The Seam Allowance*, p. 102.

19. *Ibid*, p. 107.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

21. Of the policy issues discussed in this section of the paper, the first two, that is, immigration policy and language training, have been included in a number of other research studies published over the past decade. In other areas, such as employment training and skills upgrading, and credentials, there has been relatively little research to date. Readers who are interested in pursuing previous policy research on immigrant women are referred to the following key works, in addition to the specific citations in the text:
    - Action Committee on Immigrant and Visible Minority Women, *Final Report, June 1985-January 1987* (s.l.: 1987);
    - Sheila McLeod Arnopoulos, *Problems of Immigrant Women in the Canadian Labour Force*;
    - Monica Boyd, *Migrant Women in Canada: Profiles and Policies*; and
    - Alma Estable, *Immigrant Women in Canada — Current Issues.*

22. Canada, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration, *Ninth Report on Family Reunification*, 33rd Parliament, lst session (Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, June 17, 1986), p. 47.

23. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Family Reunification: Response to the Ninth Report of the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration* (Ottawa: October 1986), p. 6.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

25. Milagros Paredes, "Immigrant Women and Second-Language Education: A Study of Unequal Access to Linguistic Resources", *Resources for Feminist Research/Documentation sur la recherche féministe*, vol. 16, no. 1 (March 1987), p. 23.

26. K. Seydegart and G. Spears, *Beyond Dialogue: Immigrant Women in Canada, 1985-1990*, a Plan for Action Arising from a National Consultation Commissioned by Multiculturalism Canada (Ottawa: Erin Research Inc., 1985), p. 38.

27. Telephone interview with Betty Butterworth, Senior Manager, Citizenship Education Section, Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, Toronto, May 1987.

28. Telephone interview with Sally Andrews, Policy Analyst, Corporate Policy Branch, Secretary of State, Ottawa, May 1987.

29. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Employment Manual* (Ottawa: April 1986), p. 17.

30. Action Committee on Immigrant and Visible Minority Women, *Final Report, June 1985-January 1987*, p. 30. (E.S.L. — F.S.L. stands for English as a Second Language — French as a Second Language.)

31. Canadian Human Rights Commission, *Annual Report 1986* (Ottawa: 1987), p. 15.

32. Paredes, "Immigrant Women and Second-Language Education", p. 24.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

34. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Settlement Language Training Program (SLTP)*, a brief to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration (Ottawa: 1986).

35. The TESL Canada Federation (TESL Canada) is the national organization in support of English as a second language (ESL) services. Their report, *The Settlement Language Training Program*, was written by B. Burnaby, M. Holt, H. Steltzer, and N. Collins and prepared in June 1987 for the Research Division, Policy and Program Development Branch, Immigration Group.

36. Burnaby et al., *The Settlement Language Training Program*, p. 18.

37. *Ibid.*

38. At the Secretary of State, the review of language training programs is being conducted on an informal basis through the exchange of correspondence at the senior management and program officer levels. At CEIC, the Minister is currently evaluating the SLTP project, which expired in March 1987.

39. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *News Release* (Halifax: June 12, 1987).

40. A severely employment-disadvantaged person will be defined as one who is unemployed; has attained school-leaving age; and faces significant barriers in securing and maintaining employment due to problematic work habits, attitudes and motivation problems, a serious lack of education or training, prolonged periods of institutionalization, functional illiteracy, a long history of drug or alcohol abuse, or lack of ability in the official languages.

41. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, Canadian Jobs Strategy, "Program Summary Charts", Ottawa, April 1987.

42. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, Innovations Branch, *National Labour Market Innovations Program: Current Projects* (Ottawa: April 30, 1987).

43. Unpublished data provided by Planning and Monitoring Branch, Canadian Jobs Strategy, Employment and Immigration Canada.

44. *Ibid.*

45. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, "The Canadian Jobs Strategy: A Review of the First Eighteen Months", an internal memorandum, Ottawa, May 15, 1987, p. 6.

46. Action Committee on Immigrant and Visible Minority Women, *Final Report, June 1985-January 1987*, p. 20.

47. Frank Trovato and Carl F. Grindstaff, "Economic Status: a Census Analysis of Immigrant Women at Age Thirty in Canada", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology/Revue canadienne de sociologie et d'anthropologie*, vol. 23, no. 4 (1986), pp. 569-587.

48. *Ibid.*, table 1, p. 573.

49. Abt Associates of Canada, *Access to Trades and Professions in Ontario*, a report prepared for Ontario, Cabinet Committee on Race Relations (Toronto: May 6, 1987), p. 3.

50. Telephone interview with Richard Clarke, Senior Policy Advisor, Policy Branch, Ontario Ministry of Labour, Toronto, June 1987.

51. Abt Associates of Canada, *Access to Trades and Professions in Ontario*, p. 61.

52. *Ibid.*, p. 106.

53. Action Committee on Immigrant and Visible Minority Women, *Final Report, June 1985-January 1987*, p. 38.

54. The Council of Ministers of Education in Canada (CMEC) is a national secretariat comprised of all the provincial Ministers of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Ministers of Post-secondary Education. It was formed in 1967 to coordinate information between and activities of the provinces regarding educational policy and development. The Ministers and Deputy Ministers of Education meet at least twice yearly to exchange information and coordinate policy. Ad hoc committees are formed on a regular basis to study issues of common concern and to generate recommendations regarding education policy.

55. Telephone interview with Tim Douglas, Director, International Relations, Council of Ministers of Education in Canada, Toronto, May 25, 1987.

56. *Ibid.*

57. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, "New Counselling Form for Immigrating Physicians", *Press Release* (Ottawa: March 27, 1987).

58. Joint Working Group on Graduates of Foreign Medical Schools, *Report to the Federal/Provincial Advisory Committee on Health Human Resources*, prepared for Health and Welfare Canada (Ottawa: October 1986), p. 3.

59. Telephone interview with Dr. Dupont, Director, Health Human Resources Section, Health Services and Promotion Branch, Health and Welfare Canada, Ottawa, July 1987.

60. *Jamorski, Pawlowska-Dobosz, Blaszczyk, Pajak-Kopac and Bienkowski v. Attorney General of Ontario*, Report of the Supreme Court of Ontario (Toronto: April 16, 1987), p. 39.

61. McLeod Arnopoulos, *Problems of Immigrant Women in the Canadian Labour Force*.

62. Telephone interview with Betty Butterworth, May 1987.

63. Canada, House of Commons, Special Committee on Child Care, *Sharing the Responsibility*, 33rd Parliament, 2nd session (Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, March 1987), p. 72.

64. Canada, Task Force on Child Care, *Report* (Ottawa: Status of Women Canada, 1986), p. 89.

65. *Ibid.*

66. Canada, House of Commons, Special Committee on Child Care, *Sharing the Responsibility*, p. 72.

67. Karen Mock, "Early Childhood Education in a Multicultural Society", cited in Canada, Task Force on Child Care, *Report*, pp. 89-90.

68. National Conference on Immigrant Women, *The Immigrant Woman in Canada. A Right to Recognition. Part 2. Recommendations from the Conference*, Toronto, March 20-22, 1981 (Ottawa: Multiculturalism Directorate, Secretary of State, 1981), p. 7.

69. Laura Climenko Johnson, *Who Cares? A Report of the Project Child Care Survey of Parents and their Child Care Arrangements* (Toronto: Community Day Care Coalition and the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, November 1979), table 3.9, p. 72.

70. Computation based on Johnson, *"Who Cares?"*, table 7.5, p. 235.

71. Canada, House of Commons, Special Committee on Child Care, *Sharing the Responsibility*, p. 73.

72. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

73. Previous discussion of this issue may be found in the following selection of studies, in addition to the specific citations in the text:
    - Action Committee on Immigrant and Visible Minority Women, *Final Report. June 1985-January 1987*;
    - Sheila McLeod Arnopoulos, *Problems of Immigrant Women in the Canadian Labour Force*;
    - Monica Boyd, *Migrant Women in Canada: Profiles and Policies*;
    - Monica Boyd and Chris Taylor, "The Feminization of Temporary Workers: The Canadian Case", in *International Migration*, vol. 24, no. 4 (December 1986), pp. 717-734;
    - Monica Boyd, Chris Taylor, and Paul Delaney, "Temporary Workers in Canada", *International Migration Review*, vol. 20, no. 4 (winter 1986), pp. 929-950;
    - Rina Cohen, "The Work Conditions of Immigrant Women Live-in Domestics: Racism, Sexual Abuse and Invisibility", *Resources for Feminist Research/Documentation sur la recherche féministe*, vol. 16, no. 1 (March 1987), pp. 36-38; and
    - Alma Estable, *Immigrant Women in Canada — Current Issues*.

74. The Canadian employment authorization program is based on regulations promulgated in 1973 and incorporated into the 1976 *Immigration Act*. The program meets "temporary labour needs and . . . also provides an opportunity to work for migrants who are already in Canada or who will come to Canada for noneconomic reasons". (Monica Boyd, *Migrant Women in Canada: Profiles and Policies*, p. 7.) The program enables foreign workers to apply for a temporary employment authorization once a Canada Employment Centre has verified that the job offer from a Canadian employer provides wages and working conditions set by Canadian labour standards and that hiring a foreign worker will not take a job away from a qualified Canadian resident.

75. Unpublished data from Employment and Immigration Canada cited by Louise Renaud in "A Study in the Persistence of Poor Working Conditions and Low Status: Immigrant Domestic Workers in Canada", M.A. thesis, Ottawa, Carleton University, 1984, table 8, p. 92.

76. Canada, Task Force on Immigration Practices and Procedures, *Domestic Workers on Employment Authorizations* (Ottawa: Employment and Immigration Canada, 1981), p. 13.

77. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 91.

79. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Domestic Workers on Employment Authorizations: A Revised Policy* (Ottawa: November 1981).

80. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Immigration Manual* (Ottawa: January 1986), section 4.41(4).

81. *Ibid.*, section 4.22.

82. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Domestic Workers on Employment Authorizations: A Revised Policy.*

83. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, Policy and Program Development Branch, *Foreign Domestic Movement. Statistical Highlight 1985* (Ottawa: June 1986), p. 1.

84. Discrepancies in data — The data indicated in Table 11 are difficult to interpret for a number of reasons:
    - the "requests received" will be overstated if: a domestic applies for landing at more than one immigration office, a domestic is ultimately processed for landing in the Assisted Relative or Family Classes, or if the domestic withdraws her/his application or leaves Canada prior to processing.
    - because a request which will ultimately be accepted requires a minimum of nine months for processing, a portion of requests received in a given year will be compiled as requests accepted during the following year; e.g., in 1985 there were more requests accepted than requests received. Some of the requests accepted would represent applications made in previous years.
    - there is a degree of double counting in that a request received in 1982, for example, could appear as "on hold" or "furthered for training" during that year. In a subsequent year the same application could appear as a "request accepted".

85. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Immigration Manual*, section 4.41 (2 vi) (Ottawa: April 1986).

86. Telephone interview with Judith Ramirez, founder, International Coalition to End Domestics' Exploitation (INTERCEDE), Toronto, June 30, 1987.

87. Calculation based on the findings of a survey of both foreign and Canadian-born domestics undertaken for the Ontario Ministry of Labour. The survey looked at households in Toronto, Ottawa, and London. Ontario, Ministry of Labour, *News Release* (Toronto: June 9, 1987).

88. According to CEIC officials directly involved in the Foreign Domestic Movement, the selection criteria in the revised procedures are not new, and have, in fact, been in place in an informal way for many years. However, because the criteria were not explicitly included in the *Immigration Manual*, they were subject to interpretation and uneven application. The objective of the new procedures, therefore, is to clarify the criteria and make them more explicit.

89. Canada, Employment and Immigration Canada, *Immigration Manual*, draft procedures (Ottawa: 1987), section 4.41 3)a).

90. *Ibid.*, section 4.41 3)c).

91. The validity of the foregoing critique of the revised selection criteria will be difficult to evaluate if and when the new procedures are implemented. There is currently no attempt to record or analyse the cultural characteristics of applicants refused temporary entry; it would therefore be problematic to determine the impact of the criteria on non-French speaking, non-English speaking women from the developing nations who would formerly have been granted entry to Canada. As a proximate measure of the program's impact, the cultural characteristics of successful applicants under the old procedures and under the revised procedures could be compared over time.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


Abt Associates of Canada. *Access to Trades and Professions in Ontario.* Report prepared for Ontario, Cabinet Committee on Race Relations. Toronto: May 6, 1987.

Action Committee on Immigrant and Visible Minority Women. *Final Report. June 1985-January 1987.* s.l.: 1987.

Andrews, Sally. Policy Analyst, Corporate Policy Branch, Secretary of State, Ottawa. Telephone interview, May 1987.

Arnopoulos, Sheila McLeod. *Problems of Immigrant Women in the Canadian Labour Force.* Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, January 1979.

Beaujot, Roderic. *The Relative Economic Situation of Immigrants in Canada: Review of Past Studies and Multivariate Analysis on 1981 Data.* Report prepared for "The Review of Demography and its Implications for Economic and Social Policy", Health and Welfare Canada. London: University of Western Ontario, October 1986.

Boyd, Monica. "At a Disadvantage: The Occupational Attainments of Foreign Born Women in Canada". *International Migration Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, winter 1984, pp. 1091-1119.

_____. "Immigrant Women in Canada". In *International Migration: The Female Experience*, Ed. Rita J. Simon and Caroline Brettell. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld, 1986, pp. 45-61.

_____. *Migrant Women in Canada: Profiles and Policies.* Paper prepared for the OECD Sub-panel on Migrant Women. Paris, April 6-7, 1987. Ottawa: March 1987.

_____ ___. "Occupations of Female Immigrants and North American Immigration Statistics". *International Migration Review*, vol. 10, no. 1, spring 1976, pp. 73-80.

_____. "The Status of Immigrant Women in Canada". *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology/Revue canadienne de sociologie et d'anthropologie*, vol. 12, no. 4, part I, November 1975, pp. 406-416.

Boyd, Monica and Chris Taylor. "The Feminization of Temporary Workers: the Canadian Case". *International Migration*, vol. 24, no. 4, December 1986, pp. 717-734.

Boyd, Monica; Chris Taylor; and Paul Delaney. "Temporary Workers in Canada". *International Migration Review*, vol. 20, no. 4, winter 1986, pp. 929-950.

Burnaby, B. et al. *The Settlement Language Training Program.* Paper prepared for the Research Division, Policy and Program Development Branch, Immigration Group, Ottawa: TESL Canada, June 1987.

Butterworth, Betty. Senior Manager, Citizenship Education Section, Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, Toronto. Telephone interview, May 1987.

Canada. Employment and Immigration Canada. *A Discussion Paper on a New Framework for Immigrant Language Training.* Ottawa: March 1983.

_____. *Domestic Workers on Employment Authorizations: A Revised Policy.* Ottawa: November 1981.

_____. *Employment Manual.* Ottawa: April 1986.

_____. *Family Reunification: Response to the Ninth Report of the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration.* Ottawa: October 1986.

_____. *Immigration Manual.* Ottawa: Various dates and draft copies.

_____. *Immigration Statistics 1984.* Ottawa: 1986.

_____. *Integration of Immigrant/Migrant Women into the Canadian Labour Market: National Report of Canada to the Working Party on Migration and the OECD Working Party on the Role of Women in the Economy.* Ottawa: May 1981.

_____. *National Labour Market Innovations Program: Current Projects.* Ottawa: April 30, 1987.

_____. "New Counselling Form for Immigrating Physicians". *News Release.* Ottawa: March 27, 1987.

_____. *New Refugee Determination Legislation.* Ottawa: May 5, 1987.

_____. *News Release.* Halifax: June 12, 1987.

_____. *Response of the Employment and Immigration Commission to the INTERCEDE Report.* Ottawa: 1983.

_____. *Settlement Language Training Program (SLTP).* A Brief to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration. Ottawa: 1986.

_____. "The Canadian Jobs Strategy: A Review of the First Eighteen Months". Internal memorandum. Ottawa, May 15, 1987.

_____. *Your Rights and Canada's Immigration Law.* Ottawa: 1986.

Canada. Employment and Immigration Canada, Canadian Jobs Strategy. "Program Summary Charts". Ottawa, April 1987.

Canada. Employment and Immigration Canada, Policy and Program Development Branch. *Foreign Domestic Movement. Statistical Highlight 1985.* Ottawa: June 1986.

_____. *Immigration Levels 1988-1990: Consultation Issues.* Ottawa: February 1987.

Canada. House of Commons. *Debates.* 33rd Parliament, 2nd session. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, August 11, 1987.

Canada. House of Commons, Parliamentary Committee on Equality Rights. *Equality for All.* 33rd Parliament, 1st session. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, October 1985.

Canada. House of Commons, Special Committee on Child Care. *Sharing the Responsibility.* 33rd Parliament, 2nd session. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, March 1987.

Canada. House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration. *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration.* 33rd Parliament, 1st session. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, June 3, June 5, June 11, 1986; November 27, 1986.

_____. *Ninth Report on Family Reunification.* 33rd Parliament, 1st session. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, June 17, 1986.

Canada. Labour Canada, Women's Bureau. *Canadian Women and Job Related Laws.* Ottawa: 1985.

Canada. Secretary of State, Multiculturalism Directorate. Policy, Research and Analysis Division. *Profile of Canadians Who Speak Neither French nor English.* Ottawa, March 3, 1987.

Canada. Statistics Canada. *Canada's Immigrants.* Ottawa: August 1984. 1981 Census, catalogue no. 99-936.

_____. *Population. Labour Force Activity.* Ottawa: 1984. 1981 Census, catalogue no. 92-915.

_____. *Population. Labour Force — Occupation by Cultural Characteristics.* Ottawa: 1984. 1981 Census, catalogue no. 92-918.

Canada. Task Force on Child Care. *Report.* Ottawa: Status of Women Canada, 1986.

Canada. Task Force on Immigration Practices and Procedures. *Domestic Workers on Employment Authorizations.* Ottawa: Employment and Immigration Canada, 1981.

Canada. Textile and Clothing Board. *Report on Textiles and Clothing 1986.* Ottawa: September 30, 1986.

Canadian Human Rights Commission. *Annual Report 1986*. Ottawa: 1987.

*Canadian Labour Law Reports*. Don Mills, Ontario: CCH Canadian Ltd., February 1987.

Clarke, Richard. Senior Policy Advisor, Policy Branch, Ontario Ministry of Labour, Toronto. Telephone interview, June 1987.

Cohen, Rina. "The Work Conditions of Immigrant Women Live-in Domestics: Racism, Sexual Abuse and Invisibility". *Resources for Feminist Research/Documentation sur la recherche féministe*, vol. 16, no. 1, March 1987, pp. 36-38.

Devereaux, M.S. *One in Every Five: A Survey of Adult Education in Canada*. Ottawa: Secretary of State; Statistics Canada, 1984.

Douglas, Tim. Council of Ministers of Education, Toronto. Telephone interview, May 25, 1987.

Dupont, Dr. J.A. Director, Health Human Resources Section, Health Services and Promotion Branch, Health and Welfare Canada, Ottawa. Telephone interview. July 1987.

Estable, Alma. *Immigrant Women in Canada — Current Issues*. Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, March 1986.

Gannagé, Charlene. "A World of Difference: The Case of Women Workers in a Canadian Garment Factory". In *Feminism and Political Economy*. Ed. Heather Jon Maroney and Meg Luxton. Toronto: Methuen, 1987, pp. 139-165.

_____. *Double Day, Double Bind*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1986.

Grindstaff, Carl F. *A Socio-Demographic Profile of Immigrant Women in Canada. 1981. By Age At Immigration, For Women Age 30-44*. Prepared for "The Review of Demography and its Implications for Economic and Social Policy", Health and Welfare Canada. London: University of Western Ontario, October 1986.

International Coalition to End Domestics' Exploitation (INTERCEDE). *Implementation of the Special Policy on Foreign Domestic Workers*. Toronto: 1983.

*Jamorski, Pawlowska-Dobosz, Blaszczyk, Pajak-Kopac and Bienkowski v. Attorney General of Ontario*. Report of the Supreme Court of Ontario. Toronto: April 16, 1987.

Johnson, Laura Climenko. *Who Cares? A Report of the Project Child Care Survey of Parents and their Child Care Arrangements*. Toronto: Community Day Care Coalition and the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, November 1979.

Johnson, Laura C. and Robert E. Johnson. *The Seam Allowance: Industrial Home Sewing in Canada*. Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1982.

Joint Working Group on Graduates of Foreign Medical Schools. *Report to the Federal/Provincial Advisory Committee on Health Human Resources.* Prepared for Health and Welfare Canada. Ottawa: October 1986.

Kerr, Kevin B. *Immigration and the Canadian Labour Market.* Background Paper prepared for the Economics Division, Research Branch, Library of Parliament. Ottawa: Library of Parliament, September 1986.

Lipsig-Mummé, Carla. "Organizing Women in the Clothing Trades: Homework and the 1983 Garment Strike in Canada". *Studies in Political Economy*, vol. 22, spring 1987, pp. 41-71.

McLaughlin, Nancy. "The Labour Force Participation of Canada's Immigrants". *The Labour Force.* Ottawa: Statistics Canada, September 1985, catalogue no. 71-001.

Mock, Karen R. *Child Care Needs of Cultural Minorities.* Report prepared for the House of Commons Special Committee on Child Care. Toronto: August 1986.

National Conference on Immigrant Women. *The Immigrant Woman in Canada. Part 1. Report of the Proceedings of the Conference.* Toronto, March 20-22, 1981. Ottawa: Multiculturalism Directorate, Secretary of State, 1981.

_____. *The Immigrant Woman in Canada. Part 2. Recommendations from the Conference.* Toronto, March 20-22, 1981. Ottawa: Multiculturalism Directorate, Secretary of State, 1981.

Ng, Roxanna and Tania Das Gupta. "Nation Builders? The Captive Labour Force of Non-English-Speaking Immigrant Women". *Canadian Women's Studies/Les cahiers de la femme*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1981, pp. 83-85.

Ng, Roxanna and Judith Ramirez. *Immigrant Housewives in Canada.* Toronto: Immigrant Women's Centre, 1981.

North-South Institute and Status of Women Canada. *Women in Industry: North-South Connections.* Ottawa: North-South Institute, 1985.

Ontario. Ministry of Citizenship and Culture. *A Profile of Immigrant Women in Ontario, 1981. A Study Based on Data from the 1981 Census.* Toronto: Ethnocultural Data Base Materials Series III, Special Report Number 4, 1986.

Ontario. Ministry of Labour. "Overtime Pay and Other Benefits Set for Domestics". *News Release.* Toronto: June 9, 1987.

Ornstein, Michael D. and Raghubar D. Sharma. *Adjustment and Economic Experience of Immigrants in Canada: An Analysis of the 1976 Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants.* A Report to Employment and Immigration Canada. Toronto: York University, 1983.

Paredes, Milagros. "Immigrant Women and Second-Language Education: A Study of Unequal Access to Linguistic Resources". *Resources for Feminist Research/Documentation sur la recherche féministe*, vol. 16, no. 1, March 1987, pp. 23-27.

Ramirez, Judith. International Coalition to End Domestics' Exploitation (INTERCEDE), Toronto. Telephone interview, June 30, 1987.

Renaud, Louise. "A Study in the Persistence of Poor Working Conditions and Low Status: Immigrant Domestic Workers in Canada". M.A. Thesis. Ottawa, Carleton University, 1984.

Samuel, T.J. and B. Woloski. "The Labour Market Experiences of Canadian Immigrants". *International Migration*, vol. 23, no. 2, June 1985, pp. 225-249.

Seward, Shirley B. *Demographic Change and the Canadian Economy: An Overview*. Prepared for "The Review of Demography and its Implications for Economic and Social Policy", Health and Welfare Canada. Ottawa: Institute for Research on Public Policy, January 1987.

_____. *The Relationship Between Immigration and the Canadian Economy*. Prepared for "The Review of Demography and its Implications for Economic and Social Policy", Health and Welfare Canada. Ottawa: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1987.

Seydegart, K. and G. Spears. *Beyond Dialogue: Immigrant Women in Canada. 1985-1990*. A Plan for Action Arising from a National Consultation Commissioned by Multiculturalism Canada. Ottawa: Erin Research Inc., 1985.

Silvera, Makeda. *Silenced*. Toronto: Williams-Wallace Publishers Inc., 1984.

Tracey, Lindalee. "Writer Took Three of Those Jobs Canadians Refuse to do". *The Gazette*, April 25, 1987.

Trovato, Frank and Carl F. Grindstaff. "Economic Status: a Census Analysis of Immigrant Women at Age Thirty in Canada". *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology/Revue canadienne de sociologie et d'anthropologie*, vol. 23, no. 4, 1986, pp. 569-587.